Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-123
Wednesday
28 June 1989

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-89-123 *28 June 1989*

CONTENTS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

TASS Notes U.S. Underground Nuclear Test 1
European Demilitarization, Security Policy Viewed *[Kuznetsov in PRAVDA 26 Jun]* 1

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 27 Jun 3
Outlines Agenda for Honecker Visit *[TASS]* 3
Views Limiting Nuclear Tests *[TASS]* 3
Offers Mediation to Turkey, Bulgaria *[Ankara ANATOLIA]* 3
Condemns Palestinian Deportations *[TASS]* 3
Notes Afghan Inter-Rebel Clashes *[Moscow Radio]* 4
Human Rights, Relations With U.S. Discussed *[Zholkver, Zorin, Zubkov, Korzin on Moscow TV]* 4
CEMA Secretariat Member on Cooperation With EEC *[TASS]* 5
IAEA Conference in Dimitrovgrad Concludes *[TASS]* 6

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

President Bush Welcomes Gorbachev's Visit to FRG *[TASS]* 7
Bush Comments on Soviet-U.S. Relations *[TASS]* 7
Bush Interviewed on Relations *[TASS]* 7
TASS Cites Secretary Baker on East-West Ties 7
KGB Staffer Orlov's Sudden Death Recorded *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jun]* 8
Details of Biography Given *[TASS]* 8
U.S. Said Hindering End to Afghan Bloodshed *[TASS]* 8
Atlanta Delegation Visits Tbilisi, Georgia *[PRAVDA 16 Jun]* 9
Deputy Minister Karpov Receives Canadian Aide *[IZVESTIYA 17 Jun]* 9

China

Gorbachev Congratulates PRC's Jiang Zemin *[Moscow International]* 9
Soviet-Chinese Border 'Detente' Viewed *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 9
Commentary on Demilitarization of PRC Border *[(Pereshkov) on Moscow International]* 11
PRC Ideological Weakness Jibe Noted *[IZVESTIYA 22 Jun]* 11

Northeast Asia

Japan's Ambitions for Space Exploration Examined *[IZVESTIYA 18 Jun]* 12

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnam's Defense Minister Continues Visit 13
Le Duc Anh Interviewed *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jun]* 13
Arrives in Volgograd *[Moscow Radio]* 15
Leaves To Tour USSR *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jun]* 15
Rogachev Discusses Soviet Asian Policy *[AFP]* 15
PRAVDA Describes Cambodia Scene *[21 Jun]* 16

Near East & South Asia

POW Exchange Discussed at Islamabad Talks *[TASS]* 17

Afghanistan's Wakil Leaves Moscow After Stopover *[TASS]* 18
El Al Plane Carries Armenian Victims to Israel *[TASS]* 18
PLO's 'Abbas on Soviet-Palestinian Committee *[Moscow TV]* 18
More on Indian Commerce Minister's Visit 19
Meets With Lukyanov, Biryukova *[PRAVDA 21 Jun]* 19
Joint Ventures Agreed Upon *[Delhi Radio]* 19
Correction to Military Agreement With Iran 19

Africa

Soviet Foreign Aid Projects in Africa Criticized *[IZVESTIYA 20 Jun]* 20

East Europe

GDR's Honecker Arrives on Working Visit 23
Met by Yakovlev, Others *[TASS]* 23
More on Reception, Activities *[East Berlin ADN]* 23
Plenary Talks View Cooperation *[East Berlin ADN]* 23
Gorbachev, Central Committee Host Lunch *[East Berlin ADN]* 24
Leaves Moscow for Magnitogorsk *[East Berlin ADN]* 24
SED Welcome for Gorbachev FRG Visit Noted *[PRAVDA 23 Jun]* 24
Analyst Views Bulgarian-Turkish Conflict *[Kornilov on TASS]* 24
Hungarians on 'Anti-Sovietism' at Nagy Ceremony 25
Premier Grosz Cited *[PRAVDA 22 Jun]* 25
Veterans Make Statement *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 22 Jun]* 25
Solovyev Attends Leningrad-Dresden Days Ceremony
[LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA 13 Jun] 25

West Europe

Soviet Ship Ignores Sweden's Request To Leave *[Stockholm Radio]* 26
USSR To Mediate Between Bulgaria, Turkey *[Ankara Radio]* 26
USSR Reportedly Sends Troops to Bulgaria *[Istanbul TERCUMAN 21 Jun]* 26
Embassy Official in Turkey on Defection, Bulgaria *[Istanbul GUNAYDIN 21 Jun]* 27
Border Protocol Initialed With Turkey *[Ankara ANATOLIA]* 28
Gen Varennikov Cited on German Reunification *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION]* 28
Shevardnadze Receives Outgoing Envoys 29
FRG Ambassador *[TASS]* 29
Cyprus Ambassador *[TASS]* 29

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

27 Jun Meeting of USSR Supreme Soviet Reported 30
Opening Session *[Moscow Radio]* 30
Second Session *[Moscow Radio]* 31
Evening Session *[Moscow Radio]* 33
Ryzhkov's 27 Jun Report to Supreme Soviet *[PRAVDA 28 Jun]* 34
Ryzhkov Answers Deputies' Questions *[Moscow Radio]* 41
Gorbachev Delivers Concluding Speech 27 Jun *[Moscow Radio]* 44
Lukyanov's 27 Jun Supreme Soviet Speech *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Correspondent Reports From 27 Jun Supreme Soviet *[Moscow Radio]* 47
'Active Work' in Recess Noted 47
Ryzhkov Questioned During Break 47
TASS Reports on 27 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings 49
Proposed Government Debated 49
Council of Ministers Endorsed 49
28 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported 50
Government Composition Deliberated *[TASS]* 50
Deputy Chairmen Endorsed *[TASS]* 50

Maslyukov, Voronin Questioned *[TASS]* 50
Economist Abalkin Questioned *[Moscow Radio]* 51
Deputies Discuss Candidates Before Supreme Soviet *[IZVESTIYA 24 Jun]* 51
Committees, Commissions Vote on Candidates *[IZVESTIYA 26 Jun]* 53
Draft Ecological Program Presented to Committees *[TASS]* 54
Soviet of the Union Chairman Primakov Interviewed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 21 Jun]* 55
Gorbachev Thanks Leaders for Congratulations *[TASS]* 59
Chebrikov Meets With Civil Aviation Workers *[TASS]* 59
Urges Workers To Defend Party Line *[Moscow TV]* 60
Yakovlev Addresses Social Sciences Institute *[TASS]* 61
People's Congress Promotes Rule-of-Law State *[IZVESTIYA 14 Jun]* 61
Interior Ministry Spokesman on Fergana Unrest *[TASS]* 63
Tension Persists in Fergana *[TASS]* 63
More Reports on Novyy Uzen Disturbances, Unrest 64
PRAVDA Reports on 23 Jun Situation *[24 Jun]* 64
Kazakh Prosecutor Cited *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 25 Jun]* 64
Novyy Uzen Situation 'Normalizing' *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 65
Calm 'For Past 24 Hours' Noted *[TASS]* 65
Production 'Difficulties' Felt *[Moscow Radio]* 65
Interior Ministry Spokesman on Militia Restructuring *[TASS]* 66

Economic

More Economic Independence, Change Urged
[SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA 15 Jun] 66

Agricultural

Ligachev, Baklanov Visit 'Gorizont' Plant *[PRAVDA 27 Jun]* 68
Nikonov Addresses Kiev Soil Conference *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 17 Jun]* 69
Early June Weather, Crop Developments Reported *[SELSKAYA ZHIZN 15 June]* 71

Scientific

'Resurs-F' Satellite Launched 27 Jun *[TASS]* 72
Space Official on 'Astron' Satellite Program *[Moscow Radio]* 72

Military

Further Reportage on Nuclear Submarine Accident 72
Sub Arrives in Severomorsk *[TASS]* 72
Military Paper Reports Incident *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 27 Jun]* 73
Makarov Cited on Safety Precautions *[TASS]* 73
Yazov Describes Towing Operation *[IZVESTIYA 28 Jun]* 73
Vice Admiral Interviewed *[Moscow TV]* 74
Further on Chernavin's Remarks *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Jun]* 75

TASS Notes U.S. Underground Nuclear Test

LD2706215189 Moscow TASS in English 2134 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Washington June 28 TASS—The United States staged on Tuesday another nuclear weapon test code-named Amarillo. A nuclear device with a yield of from 20 to 150 kilotons was exploded at the Nevada range at a depth of 6,400 meters. This is the second nuclear test over the past seven days and the seventh one of the announced U.S. tests this year.

European Demilitarization, Security Policy Viewed

PM2706140189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 26 Jun 89 Second Edition p 6

[Article by Vladlen Kuznetsov under the rubric "View From Moscow": "Europe: Politics and Weapons"]

[Text] Recently there have been quite a few events in Europe enabling it to regard the future with greater confidence. Two classes of nuclear weapons are disappearing from its soil. In Vienna the so long awaited talks on conventional arms reduction from the Atlantic to the Urals and on new military confidence building measures are gaining momentum. Official relations have been established between CEMA and the EEC. The Vienna meeting of representatives of the all-European conference states has devised a multifaceted long-term cooperation program. M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the FRG, which began a new chapter in our countries' mutual relations, his forthcoming visit to France, the summit in Finland due in the fall, and other contacts between states and parties demonstrate the increasing significance and dynamism of political cooperation in Europe.

The USSR and the other socialist countries are making a particularly valuable contribution to the process of demilitarizing the continent which has begun. They have unilaterally embarked on a reduction of their armed forces, military hardware, and defense budgets. The Soviet Union has begun to withdraw some of its troops from the territory of allied countries. Without waiting to see how the stormy discussion within NATO on the fate of tactical nuclear weapons is going to end, Moscow decided to withdraw 500 nuclear warheads from Europe.

The Warsaw Pact states' readiness for far-reaching measures to reduce military confrontation and their new political thinking are having a profound influence on attitudes in Western Europe and the stance of ruling circles there. In the NATO countries the myth of the "Soviet military threat" is evaporating and the desire to answer the goodwill signals with similar gestures is growing. The most notable positive changes in the West undoubtedly include the FRG's more flexible, constructive, and independent stance on security policy questions. That stance corresponds to the moods in the majority of the small NATO countries.

Nevertheless, I would not venture to claim that untroubled times are in store for Europe. The forces of confrontation have no intention of capitulating or of yielding their ground. They are reforming their ranks and using more sophisticated tactics. For that reason the Warsaw Pact states had every reason to state that the international situation remains complex and contradictory and that there has been no fundamental change for the better yet. Therefore their appeal to the NATO countries in connection with that organization's 40th anniversary to use the opportunity now appearing to completely eliminate the aftereffects of the cold war in Europe and beyond it remains relevant.

It is too soon to be complacent about Europe's present and future. The situation in Europe is such that we must not lower our guard.

You would think that the Soviet-U.S. treaty which is in force and is being successfully implemented should facilitate further nuclear disarmament in Europe. But the new U.S. Administration categorically opposed the "third zero" and a nuclear-free Europe and refuses point blank to hold talks on the reduction of tactical nuclear weapons in parallel to the Vienna debates on conventional arms reductions.

You would think that after the successful conclusion of the Vienna meeting Europe would move toward such a level of good-neighborliness and set itself such lofty targets, like the creation of the common European home, that there would be virtually no room for the fragmentation of an already divided continent or for interstate intrigues. Yet the new U.S. Administration stubbornly continues to declare its commitment to the notorious policy of differentiation, which divides the European socialist countries into those which are to be offered the "carrot" and those which must be urged on with the "stick."

Washington's European strategy is based on the desire to maintain—with minimum losses—its military presence in Europe and, thus, the present level of military confrontation on the continent, to block further real nuclear disarmament, and to preserve the strategy of deterrence and intimidation come what may, even though President Bush also promises to go beyond that and to take part in building a "less militarized Europe."

The general plan is to pressurize and weaken world socialism from a position of strength. To use the threat of modernization and arms upgrading to force the USSR and the other socialist countries to make concessions. The Americans regard cautiously and jealously the development of business-like cooperation on an all-European basis and the reciprocal relations developing between CEMA and the EEC. There is a clear intention to suppress unorthodox thinking within NATO and to strictly control the development of relations between the socialist and capitalist parts of Europe. In brief, by relying on nuclear and non-nuclear weapons Washington would like to run European politics according to its own

taste and discretion. The common European home has no place in this scenario. America's leaders miss no opportunity to voice their skepticism on that idea.

In the process they are trying to seduce Western Europe with the offer of involvement in the U.S. leadership of the "free world." To Eastern Europe they offer the assurance that they "want to see it free, prosperous, and living in peace." At the same time, though, they do not forget to put forward a whole catalogue of tough demands and conditions with the reminder that the White House's favor "has to be earned." But how? Essentially by surrendering their positions, renouncing "collectivist Marxism," and "affiliating" with the "community of free countries" which is the only place where the "drab societies of the East," as the White House leader sees them, can begin to shine...

An analysis of the White House's statements and actions shows that we are dealing with a highly professional, highly trained foreign policy team which is purposeful and confident though sometimes extremely overconfident. Making concessions to them is risky. Nor should one overestimate the centrifugal tendencies or the depth of the disagreement within the Atlantic community as a sign of the weakening of the U.S. leadership. The results of the NATO summit in May prove that the reins which were almost loosened have been successfully tightened.

But no matter how influential the "ideologists" were in shaping U.S. foreign policy, they cannot deny a certain degree of realism and flexibility. Washington diplomacy has not been playing an exclusively destructive role in the European arena all these years. Without its constructive participation there would be no all-European process, at least not in the form that we have today. And it is very important to help those forces across the ocean which detest the policy of the new political thinking in the Old World to overcome the temptation and urge to take advantage of the processes of transformations and renewal in central and Eastern Europe.

The Warsaw Pact is an alliance of entirely independent, sovereign, and equal states. Paternalism and tutelage are as alien to this alliance as are separation and isolation. The maturity and independence of each one is reflected in the deeper understanding of common interests and common responsibility for the fate of socialism and peace. That is what is at issue at the meetings of socialist countries' leaders in Moscow and other capitals. The new quality of relations presupposes a deeply felt sense of comradeship, a more careful "synchronizing of watches." Such lofty concepts as internationalism, comradely solidarity, alliance loyalty and reliability, and mutual assistance have not only not lost their original significance but are also acquiring new dimensions and even more profound meaning.

Consolidation on a new and more lasting basis, when the individuality of each one is revealed and when the original "I" develops into a pluralist "we," will enable the Warsaw Pact to strengthen the prestige of the socialist community in Europe and the world, ensure the reliability of its positions, and enhance still further its constructive role in European and world affairs. And thereby answer the challenge of the times and fulfill its mission as guarantor of stability and security on European soil.

Gerasimov Holds Foreign Ministry Briefing 27 Jun

Outlines Agenda for Honecker Visit

LD2706135489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1231 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jun (TASS)—"The Soviet people welcome the visit by Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] and chairman of the GDR Council of State, and express their conviction that its results will be a powerful confirmation of the community of CPSU and SED goals, and of the traditions of inviolable friendship and brotherhood between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the GDR, stated Gennadiy Gerasimov, chief of the USSR Foreign Ministry's Information Directorate, at a briefing.

The representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry noted that the schedule of the working visit, which begins today, envisages a meeting between Erich Honecker and Mikhail Gorbachev on the morning of 28 June. That afternoon, Erich Honecker will fly to Magnitogorsk, where he will spend 2 days participating in the celebrations marking the city's 60th anniversary. He was invited to the jubilee by the city party committee and the city soviet of people's deputies as an honored guest and as a former participant in the construction of the Magnitogorsk metalurgical combine.

Views Limiting Nuclear Tests

LD2706140189 Moscow TASS in English 1348 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—The Soviet Union is ready, as before, for the most radical solution of the problem of limiting and terminating nuclear testing: its complete and immediate termination, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told reporters here on Wednesday. Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the ministry's Information Directorate, was commenting on Soviet-U.S. talks on the limitation and termination of nuclear testing, which were resumed on Monday.

He said that the Soviet delegation to the talks will seek, as the first step, successful completion of preparations for ratification of the Soviet-American treaties on the limitation on underground nuclear weapon tests of 1974 and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes of 1976.

Taking into account the results of the joint verification experiment, held at the testing sites in Nevada and near Semipalatinsk last August and September, the [words indistinct] draft and coordinate a verification protocol for the 1974 treaty.

Gerasimov said that the Soviet delegation has been instructed to complete this work within the shortest possible time.

This, he went on, would make it possible to submit the 1974 and 1976 treaties for ratification and immediately begin the next stage of the talks—joint drafting of an agreement on further limitations on the yield and number of nuclear tests as an important step toward their complete termination.

Offers Mediation to Turkey, Bulgaria

TA2706162189 Ankara ANATOLIA in English 1600 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow (A.A)—Answering questions from A.A. at a news conference today, Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Gennadiy Gerasimov declared that the Soviet Union could act as a mediator in establishing a constructive dialogue between Turkey and Bulgaria. Gerasimov recalled that Bulgaria is a Warsaw Pact member but said that Turkey, on the other hand, is a country with which they want to develop bilateral relations.

"For this reason, without resorting to any interpretation of the views of either side, we are prepared to help calm the seriously escalating tension between the two countries," he said.

Gerasimov also said that the recent trips by the Soviet ambassador in Turkey, Albert Chernyshev, to Moscow and Sofia were part of an effort to normalize relations. He went on: "We know how sensitive this issue is. Turco-Bulgarian tension has reached grave dimensions and, instead of reason, feelings have begun to play a role from time to time.

"Turkey says the people arriving from Bulgaria are being subjected to compulsory deportation, whereas Bulgaria claims they are tourists leaving the country voluntarily. You cannot expect me to take sides in this situation."

Condemns Palestinian Deportations

LD2706160689 Moscow TASS in English 1424 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—Soviet people welcome the working visit to the USSR of Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany (SUPG) Central Committee and chairman of the Council of State of the German Democratic Republic, which begins today, and express the belief that its results will forcefully confirm that the CPSU and SUPG have common goals and traditions of the inviolable friendship and fraternity of the peoples of the Soviet Union and the GDR. Gennadiy Gerasimov, head of the USSR Foreign Ministry Information Directorate, told a news briefing here today.

The programme of the visit provides for a meeting between Erich Honecker and Mikhail Gorbachev on Wednesday morning. In the latter half of the day Honecker will fly to Magnitogorsk where for two days he will take part in the celebration of the 60th anniversary of this city, Gerasimov said.

On the conference of the leaders of 21 African countries, which drew to an end in Zaire recently, Gerasimov said that in the Soviet Union its results are viewed as the first but a very important step toward a political settlement of the conflict of many years in Angola. Peace and stability in that country can be achieved with African countries' assistance the more speedily the sooner outside interference in its internal affairs is halted.

Informing those present about the resumption of the Soviet-U.S. talks on limiting and terminating nuclear tests, Gerasimov said that, as before, the Soviet side is prepared for the most radical solution of this problem—total and undelayed cessation of nuclear tests. At the resumed talks the Soviet delegation will work, as the first step, for the earliest completion of the work to prepare for ratification the Soviet-U.S treaties on limiting underground nuclear weapon tests (1974) and on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes (1976).

Gerasimov furthermore said that in the Soviet Union they condemn the inhuman practice of deporting Palestinians used by Israel on occupied territories and consider that it should be immediately stopped. The way of reprisals lead to a stalemate and sparks an escalation of tension on the occupied territories. A political dialogue is necessary, which is the sole means to achieve a comprehensive settlement of the Palestinian problems and the Arab-Israeli conflict as a whole.

On the rail disaster in the Bashkir Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic early in June, Gerasimov noted that the international community's reaction to this tragedy has confirmed once again that in our time political and social differences among states recede to the background in such situations. He expressed gratitude to the people in various countries who extended a helping hand to the trouble-plagued Soviet people.

Responding to journalists' questions regarding a tense situation in Bulgarian-Turkish relations, Gerasimov said that in the Soviet Union "we are concerned over the development of events and would like, within our capabilities, to assist the Bulgarian and Turkish sides in fostering a constructive dialogue to overcome the present difficulties through political means."

Notes Afghan Inter-Rebel Clashes

LD2706220289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1800 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] [Announcer] At a news briefing for Soviet and foreign journalists on current issues in world politics at the Moscow press center of the USSR Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Gerasimov, head of the ministry's Information Directorate, dwelt on the situation in Afghanistan. This is what he said:

[Begin Gerasimov recording] Clashes are continuing in Afghanistan between the armed opposition's own formations, which belong to various parties and groupings. Clashes have taken place between groups belonging to the Hekmatyar and Rabbani bands in Parvan Province; between detachments of Khalis, Mohammadi, and Hekmatyar in Ghazni and Paktia Provinces; in Balkh Province between detachments of Hekmatyar, Rabbani, and Mohammadi; and in Herat Province between detachments of Hekmatyar and Rabbani.

In other words, we can see that the aim of commanders of the armed opposition's detachments is to seize power locally and to extend their sphere of influence. They are shooting at one another, and, at the moment, blood is not flowing in the struggle against the Kabul regime. The blood here is pouring from those who would seem to be in the same camp and are regarded as allies. These are the people who lay claim to power in Afghanistan. What can they offer the Afghan people if they do gain power? They cannot offer peace. Only the existing regime now unites the supporters of peace. The opposition's demand for President Najibullah to resign, and the refusal to negotiate with the present government cannot lead to peace.

But even if one assumes that the republic's leadership lays its power aside, what happens next? Not a single one of the opposition groupings is capable of controlling its own supporters, let alone running the country, as is shown by the bloody clashes between the armed opposition's own formations. So that, if they do come to power, there is only one conclusion that can be drawn. If that happens, the war in Afghanistan will flare up with renewed violence. The leaders of the many parties will start to carve up power in the capital, and their armed detachments in the regions will inflict many casualties on the Afghan people. The only road to peace lies through rigorous adherence to the policy of national reconciliation proclaimed by the government of the republic. [end recording]

Human Rights, Relations With U.S. Discussed

LD2506205489 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1335 GMT 24 Jun 89

[Program entitled "Planet: International Panorama": "Political Observers of Central Television Answer Questions From Workers at the'50th Anniversary of the USSR Works'", presented by V. Tsvetov, not further identified, with "leading commentators" A. Zholkver, V. Zorin, G. Zubkov, and V. Korzin]

[Excerpts] [Zholkver] I have a question from a colleague, electrical setter Aleksandr Borisovich Renzin. He asks: Will friendly relations between the Soviet Union and the United States last long? First of all I would say that we have not yet achieved friendly relations. How long will they last? It is too early to tell. But it is a fact that in recent years a turn toward better relations, normal relations, and toward relations that could become friendly in the future has been taking place. The question

seems to have been prompted by the change of Presidents in the United States. There was Reagan, who made certain moves, including some substantial ones, to meet us halfway. Now we have Bush, who has not been so active in this way as yet.

Soviet people naturally wonder what will happen now. I want to say that Reagan effected a change of direction in his policy, not because he previously disliked us very much and then suddenly took a liking to us. Reagan was guided by objective circumstances which became evident to that rather right-wing politician in the middle of his presidency, and he was forced to begin changing direction on the basis of objective circumstances. Bush's government has come to power at a time when those objective circumstances that obliged the Reagan government to move some way to meet us remain the same.

Nothing has changed. I do think that the good relations, and the trend toward improved relations, will continue and will last. [passage omitted]

[Tsvetov] Comrades, I don't think I am mistaken if I say that the world is now beset with two problems: the problem of disarmament and the problem of human rights. One of your workers has asked a question relating to this topic.

[Zubkov] It was metal worker Aleksandr Ivanovich Shunko, who said: What are these endless conferences on human rights? They are forever travelling to the capitals of Europe and can't reach a common opinion. He is evidently referring to the participants of the conferences who travel to the capitals of Europe. I would say that it is not a question of there being too many conferences. Rather, it is a fact that for a very long time we've been unable to find common ground when discussing humanitarian problems and human rights. The actual process of those negotiations goes back to the Helsinki Conference—which you have all heard a lot about and know a lot about—on the adoption of the Final Act of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe. That was in August 1975. After Helsinki there were major meetings in Belgrade in 1977 and in Madrid—that was the longest meeting, lasting almost 4 years, from 1980 to 1983.

Then, finally, there was the most fruitful one, which is often described as a breakthrough in our international relations, in Vienna from November 1986 to January 1989. And the final document in Vienna—and here's a curious detail, in Belgrade for example, the final document only ran to three pages. There was nothing to write about. It merely put on record that the meeting had taken place. But in Vienna the final document, typewritten with double spacing, took up 160 pages. It contained a great many sections and a great many of the points in that document are connected precisely with human rights and humanitarian cooperation. Among other documents now being prepared by our Supreme Soviet is legislation entry and exit, the press, public organizations, freedom of conscience concerning our religious beliefs—in short, a very broad spectrum.

[Zholkver] We have been asked why it is taking so long. Well, if only for the reason that for decades we've understood human rights differently, and given it a different content. The West was talking more about individual rights, of particular people, whereas we seemed to be pretending that that was somehow not so important, and we were insisting more on collective rights—those inalienable human rights as the right to work, the right to education, the right to be taken care of in old age. The West was trying to get away from this. But now it seems to me that a certain rapprochement of views is taking place in the sense of interpretation, with us beginning to speak more and more broadly about individual human rights and the need to defend them, and the West to a lesser extent as yet but still gradually moving toward a recognition that yes, such things as the right to work are included in human rights and there's no point in shying away from this. [passage omitted]

CEMA Secretariat Member on Cooperation With EEC

LD2406063289 Moscow TASS in English 0625 GMT 24 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 24 TASS—Following the signing of the joint declaration, the development of relations between the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance (CMEA) and the European Economic Community (EEC), as organisations, between EEC and separate CMEA member-countries should proceed, under the agreement reached, in parallel. However, the process of the development of relations between separate CMEA member-countries and EEC goes undoubtedly faster.

Asked by TASS diplomtic corespondent what holds back the process of the development of relations between CMEA and EEC, as organisations, Sergey Ugarov, and adviser of the CMEA secretariat who is engaged in the issues of East-West and CMEA-EEC relations, answered:

"Although two meetings of the two organisations' experts have been held since the signing of the joint declaration, as is stipulated by the document, although CMEA proposed seven concrete areas of possible cooperation, the matter has not come as yet to a detailed discussion of the methods and forms of interaction in each of these areas."

At the same time, he expressed hope that at least one of the possible areas of cooperation of those proposed by CMEA will be discussed at the third meeting which is planned to be convened toward the end of this year. Supposedly, at issue will be environmental protection.

One of the snags on the way toward boosting cooperation between the two organisations is that in the West they have not completely abandoned the formula under which emphasis is put on the development of EEC's

relations with separate CMEA member-countries, which makes it possible to approach in a differential manner the terms of cooperation, Ugarov went on.

The West also relies on the old thesis that CMEA and EEC have different competence. In this regard, the Soviet expert stressed that the powers which are vested with CMEA are quite sufficient to conduct negotiations on relations in the areas of cooperation, which have already been proposed. On the part of CMEA, there is no delay. The faster the Commission of the European Communities defines its attitude to the CMEA proposals, the sooner the negotiations between CMEA and EEC will produce specific results.

IAEA Conference in Dimitrovgrad Concludes

LD2406090989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1740 GMT 23 Jun 89

[Text] Dimitrovgrad (Ulyanovskaya Oblast), 23 Jun (TASS)—The further development and improvement of nuclear reactor building holds the key to the most rational solution not only of energy problems, but also of the acute ecological problems facing the world community. This was particularly emphasized at the 11th international conference on nuclear power of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) technical committee's sessions which ended today in Dimitrovgrad.

Taking part in them were the USSR, China, Bulgaria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Romania, and Yugoslavia, as well as representatives of the United States, Great Britain, Japan, France, the FRG, Switzerland, the Netherlands, Italy, Indonesia, and Turkey.

For 5 days the representatives of these countries and of international organizations exchanged views and experiences on specific issues directly connected with the design, licensing, construction, operation, and safety of high-temperature gas-cooled reactors. It was noted that the future belongs to such reactors, since they make it possible to exclude accidents such as Chernobyl, regardless of all human error and unforeseen equipment failure.

"This differed from previous similar meetings," learned IAEA secretary Jurgen Kupitz [name as received] told TASS, "in that among the participants there was a preponderance, not of research scientists, but of managers, in other words, experts directly involved in the practical application of the best plans. It is entirely natural that the meeting should have subjected to especially rigorous examination both the technical aspects and economic and the ecological ones, and the issues of nuclear and radiation safety." We have every reason to express satisfaction with the way the meeting went, the learned IAEA secretary said. The review reports, which nearly all the representatives of the delegations delivered, were constructive and above all, open.

In the opinion of the IAEA leader, the Soviet side is making a substantial contribution to the development of businesslike cooperation and scientific contacts; more than half of the reports examined at the IAEA technical committee were by scientists and experts from the Soviet Union.

United States & Canada

President Bush Welcomes Gorbachev's Visit to FRG

LD2706203389 Moscow TASS in English 1951 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Washington June 27 TASS—U.S. President George Bush hailed Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's recent visit to West Germany at a White House news conference Tuesday.

Bush said he had discussed Gorbachev's visit with West German Chancellor Helmut Kohl personally, and added that the Soviet leader "got a good, warm response in Germany."

Asked about prospects for a Soviet-U.S. summit meeting, Bush said that this matter had been discussed and will be discussed again.

The President also said that he'd like the meeting "to be seen as productive rather than just the meeting itself."

Bush Comments on Soviet-U.S. Relations

LD2806010889 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1532 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Washington, 27 Jun (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev's recent visit to the FRG was a fine event, U.S. President George Bush stated on Tuesday, having arranged one of his "unexpected" news conferences in the White House press room early in the morning.

I have discussed this visit personally with Federal Chancellor Kohl. Mikhail Gorbachev was received very warmly in the FRG, the President noted.

I am pleased that a good understanding has now been established between us and the Soviet Union. I think that the Soviet side knows that we want to move forward at the strategic offensive arms talks. They know that we are ready to move forward quickly in discussions of reducing conventional armaments, G. Bush said. He pointed out that lately there has been a noticable "drawing together on some of these broad objectives" between the USSR and the United States.

At the same time, the President went on, "some small and splendid events" are happening: A Soviet vessel is taking part in operations to clean the oil pollution from the Alaskan bay and a U.S. team of experts is doing all it can to help the burn victims of the Bashkiriya tragedy. So, noted G. Bush, "a very, very important atmosphere" has been created which will "help to work out details" in the agreement on reducing strategic weapons and in other questions.

Answering questions regarding the possibility of holding a Soviet-U.S. summit in the near future, Bush said that this question has been and will be discussed again. In his words, continuous communication between the Soviet and U.S. leaderships is being maintained. "I would like this meeting to be productive," said the President and added that this summit does not have to be linked with the signing of some major agreement.

"I think that relations with the Soviet Union are developing in a generally correct direction, despite the fact that huge differences continue to exist and that I am, as I was before, cautious," stressed the head of the U.S. Administration.

Bush Interviewed on Relations

LD2806103489 Moscow TASS in English 0858 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] New York June 27 TASS—"I think we're moving generally—albeit cautiously—in the right direction with the Soviets", President of the United States George Bush said in an interview to THE NEW YORK TIMES published today. He is of the opinion that his administration can have productive relations with the Soviet leadership.

"I don't think they sense that I want to set the clock back or that our foreign policy is designed in some way to drag its feet or put them in a difficult position—their having been out front of certain initiatives", the President said. At the same time, Bush actually repeated the reports that appeared earlier in the press to the effect that Washington has not been advancing any new approaches so far at the talks on nuclear and space arms in Geneva.

The President was asked if there is something to be done to give a spurt to the talks by taking some steps related to the programmes connected with "Star Wars" and sea-launched cruise missiles. Bush said that in his view, "we don't have to give on our conviction about S.D.I." to move the negotiations forward.

A number of othe international problems came up for discussion during the interview. The President, specifically, said that "it would be counter-productive right now" to take any steps toward Iran.

TASS Cites Secretary Baker on East-West Ties

LD2406030789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0835 GMT 23 Jun 89

[Text] Washington, 23 Jun (TASS)—The changes in Soviet politics are revolutionary and the administration hopes they will succeed, said U.S. Secretary of State James Baker on Thursday. He spoke at the latest hearings on the subject of "NATO and East-West relations" in the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress.

Speaking about the profound changes taking place in the socialist countries, Baker expressed the view that it is in the interests of the West to cooperate with them in solving international problems. "Right now, when we are managing to reduce the military confrontation in

Europe, said the secretary of state, we must turn the North Atlantic union in the direction of accomplishing new tasks." He noted, in particular, the importance of cooperation in settling regional conflicts in the world, in solving the problem of the spread of chemical and nuclear weapons and also of their delivery systems. Joint efforts aimed at protecting the environment are also of great importance. "Our efforts, he said, must not be restricted to cooperation between countries of the West. These new threats create an equal threat to allies, friends, and opponents."

"As the President stressed during his trip (to Europe), the United States is and will remain a European power. Together we will take courageous steps to make war in Europe unthinkable and impossible," said the U.S. secretary of state.

KGB Staffer Orlov's Sudden Death Recorded

PM2706213889 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 First Edition p 4

[Obituary: "In Memory of M.Ye. Orlov"]

[Text] Mikhail Yevgenyevich Orlov (Glenn Michael Souther), Soviet intelligence officer and KGB staffer, died suddenly 22 June 1989 at the age of 32.

M.Ye. Orlov lived a short yet brilliant and full life, which he devoted entirely to the struggle to avert the threat of nuclear disaster hanging over mankind and to secure a better future for people. He spent a long period performing responsible special assignments and made a great contribution to ensuring the Soviet Union's state security. That struggle demanded tremendous personal courage and required all his physical and spiritual strength.

The passing of Mikhail Yevgenyevich Orlov (Glenn Michael Souther) is a tremendous loss to us all.

The leadership of the USSR KGB and his working colleagues express sincere and profound condolences to M.Ye. Orlov's relatives and friends.

The bright memory of a courageous intelligence officer, a convinced internationalist, and a gifted, sympathetic, and good man will remain in Soviet people's grateful hearts forever.

[Signed] The USSR KGB Collegium and working comrades.

Details of Biography Given

LD2706185389 Moscow TASS in English 1140 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—The Soviet Army newspaper KRASNAYA ZVEZDA today carried an obituary on the death of Soviet intelligence agent Mikhail Orlov (Glenn Michael Souther) at the age of 32.

The obituary said that Orlov lived a short but bright and substantive life, wholly devoted to efforts to ward off the threat of nuclear catastrophe looming large over mankind and to secure a better future for people.

For a long time he performed important special assignments and made a large contribution to ensuring Soviet state security, it added.

The newspaper IZVESTIYA reported last year that Orlov (Souther) graduated from Old Dominion University in the United States in 1986 and in April that year he became a U.S. Navy analyst at a secretive intelligence centre.

He sailed on different ships of the U.S. 6th Fleet, including the Nimitz aircraft-carrier and the staff vessels Albany and Puget Sound.

For some time Orlov (Souther) was a personal photographer of the commander of the 6th Fleet and of his trusted press secretary. Later he worked as an aerospace intelligence analyst at the U.S. Naval base at Norfolk.

In 1988 the Supreme Soviet Presidium granted Souther political asylum in the Soviet Union and he lived in the USSR ever since.

U.S. Said Hindering End to Afghan Bloodshed

LD2206144189 Moscow TASS in English 1336 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Washington June 22 TASS—The U.S. Administration still intends to support the armed anti-Afghan opposition, making it more difficult to bring about an end to the bloodshed in Afghanistan as soon as possible.

Richard Boucher, official spokesman for the U.S. Department of State, said at a briefing on Wednesday that U.S. assistance to the Afghan Mojahedin would continue.

The assistance is being maintained in the military and humanitarian fields, he said.

While advocating in words a political settlement in Afghanistan and the self-determination of the Afghan people, the spokesman at the same time contended, contrary to the actual state of things, that no political self-determination was possible until Najibullah and the PDPA transfer power.

The spokesman said that Peter Tomasson, special presidential envoy to the Afghan armed opposition, whose nomination was confirmed by the U.S. Congress recently, would go to Pakistan next week for meetings with rebel leaders.

Atlanta Delegation Visits Tbilisi, Georgia

PM2206094589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Jun 89 Second Edition p 8

[Correspondent G. Lebanidze dispatch: "From Atlanta to Tbilisi; Contacts and Contracts"]

[Text] Tbilisi—Gruziya is Georgia in English. Who knows, perhaps this was a "reason" for establishing friendly ties between the Georgian SSR and one of the U.S. states—Georgia. But, however that may be, a warm, cordial welcome from the Tbilisi inhabitants awaited the delegation which arrived here a few days ago from its capital city, Atlanta, headed by Mayor Andrew Young.

"The aim of the delegation's trip," O. Melkadze, deputy chairman of the Georgian SSR Council of Ministers, said, "is to set up economic ties with Georgia. There are representatives of such major firms as Coca Cola, Portman, Delta Airlines, and others."

An agreement has been signed here between Atlanta's Chamber of Commerce and the Georgian SSR Chamber of Trade and Industry. It provides for the development of trade and economic, production, scientific-technical, and cultural ties. Assistance is planned in business negotiations, the preparation of contracts, the creation of joint enterprises, cooperation in the environmental protection sphere, the development of international tourism, the construction of tourist centers and complexes, the production of computers, machines, and equipment, and the processing of agricultural produce. The treaty envisages exchanging delegations of scientists, cultural figures, businessmen, teachers, young students, and sportsmen.

The Prospekt Mira was crowded with people that day. A ceremony dedicated to unveiling sculptures which symbolize the friendship between the U.S. and Soviet "Georgias," by a U.S. sculptor called Sergio Dolfi, took place here at the sister-cities' artistic display. A sculpture by the Georgian master carver G. Dzhaparidze will soon be sent to Atlanta, as a mark of the establishment of twin ties between Tbilisi and Atlanta.

Deputy Minister Karpov Receives Canadian Aide

PM2206101889 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
17 Jun 89 Moscow Evening Edition p 4

[TASS report under general heading: "Official Announcements"]

[Text] On 16 June USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V.P. Karpov received F. Bild [as transliterated], Canadian assistant deputy foreign minister. In the course of the conversation there was a detailed exchange of opinions on topical questions of limiting the arms race and of disarmament, first and foremost the banning of chemical weapons, the reduction of conventional armed forces in Europe, and questions of verification and confidence-building measures.

China

Gorbachev Congratulates PRC's Jiang Zemin

LD2706162689 Moscow World Service in English
1600 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] On behalf of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party and his own behalf, Mikhail Gorbachev has congratulated Jiang Zemin on his election as general secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.

In the message the Soviet leader is convinced that Soviet-Chinese relations will be developed in a spirit of friendship and neighborly cooperation, for the good of both nations and in the interests of international peace.

Soviet-Chinese Border 'Detente' Viewed

PM2706162189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
28 Jun 89 First Edition p 4

[Article by PRAVDA political observer Vsevolod Ovchinnikov: "Normalization and Military Detente"]

[Text] "The consequences of the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations are multifaceted. Ultimately they affect a variety of spheres. But one facet of this development is obvious right away: Each of the neighboring peoples has come to feel that its back is reliably and securely covered." This idea was expressed to me repeatedly in Beijing during the Soviet-Chinese summit. It was precisely this aspect of the normalization that foreign commentators stressed primarily. In the opinion of the French newspaper LE MONDE, a real step forward resulting from the Beijing meeting is the prospect of a demilitarization of the Soviet-Chinese border.

The joint communique, which was the main result document from the meeting, says the following on this point: "The two sides agreed to take steps to reduce armed forces in the Soviet-Chinese border region to the minimum level according with normal, good-neighborly relations between two countries, and also to make efforts to strengthen confidence and maintain calm in the border regions."

"A time has come when the USSR and the PRC, which have a lengthy common border, are finally going to cast off the heavy burden that they have carried for so long," the Japanese newspaper ASAHI writes. "Up to now China has kept 55 percent of its Armed Forces in the western, northern, and northeastern military regions in case of having to repel the 'threat from the north.' And the Soviet Union in turn has also deployed many troops there, from the Far East to Central Asia."

"Both countries could save vast resources through the gradual demilitarization of the 7,500 km Soviet-Chinese border, along which 700,000 Chinese and over 400,000 Soviet servicemen as well as five tank armies have

confronted each other since 1969," America's U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT writes. Britain's THE SUNDAY TIMES and a number of other papers use the same figures.

The USSR defense minister recently made public for the first time figures enabling a judgment to be made about the significance of military detente on the Soviet-Chinese border and the scale of the steps being undertaken in that direction. In his words, the Soviet troops in the Far East comprise two historically established groupings numbering 326,000 and 271,000 men. The former confronts U.S. and Japanese armed forces in the Pacific zone, Alaska, and the U.S. West Coast. The latter was originally created to protect the land borders in the east of the country. It is deployed on the territory of the Transbaykal Military District, the Mongolian People's Republic, and parts of the Far East Military District bordering China.

Three years ago in Vladivostok the Soviet Union issued an appeal for the joint establishment of new relations in the Asia-Pacific region. The hope was expressed then that in time the Soviet-Chinese border would become a line joining our countries, not separating them. As the Soviet Union and China moved toward the normalization of relations, so the distrust of their neighbor and the feeling of threat thus generated diminished. Thanks to that, reciprocal moves have been made in recent years aimed at lowering the level of military confrontation. China has reduced the total number of its Armed Forces by 1 million men. The USSR's decision to unilaterally reduce its Armed Forces by 500,000 men affects 200,000 servicemen stationed in the eastern part of the country. Furthermore, as M.S. Gorbachev explained in Beijing, 120,000 of those are in the Far East.

The ground forces there are being reduced by 12 divisions, 11 air regiments are being disbanded, and 16 warships are being withdrawn from the Pacific Fleet. The remaining divisions and units located along the Soviet-Chinese border will be reformed and will be given a strictly defensive structure. The nuclear component of the Soviet military potential is also being reduced. In accordance with the Washington treaty, 436 intermediate- and shorter-range missiles in Soviet Asia will be eliminated. As of 1984 the Soviet Union unilaterally stopped the buildup of its ground-based nuclear facilities in the east of the country and since 1986 it has not increased the number of nuclear-capable aircraft there, either.

The full normalization of relations will enable the neighboring states to advance along the path charted at the Beijing meeting. As the French newspaper LIBERATION points out, it has been decided to create a negotiating mechanism—a joint group of diplomatic and military experts which will have to define the terms of the troop withdrawals and ensure the defensive nature of border installations.

The Soviet side proposed first of all reducing the offensive components of the armed forces, limiting the scale and number of military exercises, and placing the activity of the remaining units and formations under mutual control. In the long term, however, it would be possible to work toward the border's full demilitarization, leaving there only the personnel necessary to perform ordinary border service. This is a worthy goal which can be achieved perfectly well through joint efforts.

As the joint communique records, both sides advocate resolving the remaining historic border questions between the USSR and the PRC—resolving them in a fair and rational manner, on the basis of the treaties on the present Soviet-Chinese border, according to the generally accepted norms of international law, in the spirit of equitable consultations, mutual understanding, and mutual tractability. The two countries' leaders agreed to accelerate the examination of sections of the border which have not yet been agreed on with a view to finding mutually acceptable solutions simultaneously in its eastern and western parts. The possibility of discussing the most important questions at the level of foreign minister is provided for.

Turning the Soviet-Chinese border into a belt of peace and good-neighborliness, foreign commentators point out, would not only release considerable resources for creative needs but also act as an effective factor in improving the situation in the Asia-Pacific region.

"On 15 May—the day Gorbachev arrived in Beijing—Moscow started to withdraw the Soviet troops from Mongolia," the Japanese newspaper MAINICHI notes. It would be more accurate to speak not of a start but of a continuation. After all, one motorized rifle division and several individual units returned home back in 1987. This time it was announced that in 1989-1990 three-fourths of the ground troops and an entire Air Force grouping, to wit one motorized rifle division, two armored divisions, two Air Force divisions, and a number of individual units with a total numerical strength of over 50,000 men, will be withdrawn from Mongolia.

Foreign commentators note that the Soviet Union has expressed the readiness to end its military presence in Mongolia completely once the question has been agreed with the Mongolian side. All these steps, MAINICHI believes, attest that relations between the three socialist states—the USSR, the PRC, and Mongolia—have acquired a stable basis.

The Japanese newspaper SANKEI SHIMBUN assesses M.S. Gorbachev's statement of intent to go all the way to demilitarizing the Soviet-Chinese border and the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Mongolia, which has begun, as the first steps toward military detente in the Asian-Pacific region. Although the Japanese Government has adopted a retrained stance toward these initiatives, they could have effective influence on public opinion, particularly in Japan, ASAHI adds. It cannot be

denied that as a result of the reduction of the Soviet Armed Forces in the Far East there will be an even more striking reduction in the "Soviet threat" which was used as the pretext for building up the Japanese "self-defense forces." The handshake in Beijing, the newspaper concludes, portended an easing of tension in the Asia-Pacific region.

That is perhaps the dominant motif of the foreign commentaries on the results of normalization for the situation on the world's longest dry-land border. Having put an end to the decades of unnatural alienation and returned their relations to a normal channel, the Soviet Union and China have together eliminated a serious hotbed of tension in the Far East. And, by lowering the level of military confrontation and working toward the complete demilitarization of the border, Moscow and Beijing are paving the way to military detente in the region.

Commentary on Demilitarization of PRC Border

OW2206030089 Moscow in Mandarin to Southeast Asia 1300 GMT 18 Jun 89

[(Pereshkov) commentary on demilitarization of Soviet-Chinese border; from the "World Today" program]

[Text] Dear listeners: The normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations has also manifested itself in the two countries' readiness to eliminate military confrontation in the border areas. On this, Lieutenant Colonel (Pereshkov), our military affairs observer, writes the following commentary:

I should admit that this question is of particular interest to me because I served in a Soviet military unit stationed near the Soviet-Chinese border for a fairly long period of time in the 1970's. I still (?remember) the feelings surrounding the abnormal happenings during the tension in Soviet-Chinese relations with a clear conscience. Troops were mustered on both sides of the border between the two socialist countries. I and many of my comrades regarded this as an abnormal phenomenon, a result of a certain deplorable misunderstanding. We believed that the day when reason and healthy thinking prevailed would arrive sooner or later. This day has arrived. The process of military detente on the Soviet-Chinese border has been accelerated. This cannot but delight people. I regard this as obvious proof of the two countries' intention to forever end the past and turn the joint border into a peaceful and goodneighborly one.

Here, I would like to discuss measures which have been taken by the Soviet Union to this end. Since 1985, the Soviet Union has considerably reduced its military activities in the Soviet-Chinese border areas. For example, the number of military exercises there were cut down. However, this is only a beginning. Measures on a much larger scale have been taken recently. The Soviet Union has declared that before the end of next year, the total number of troops stationed in the eastern Soviet Union will be cut by 200,000, including 120,000 in the Soviet Far East region alone. There will be 12 Army divisions, 11 Air Force regiments, and 16 war ships of the Soviet Pacific Fleet in the 200,000 troops to be retrenched.

To my knowledge, the Chinese public figures have welcomed the Soviet troop withdrawal from Mongolia. Before the end of 1990, 75 percent of the Soviet troops stationed in Mongolia will leave the country, including all Soviet Air Force units. In addition, the Soviet Union also plans, on the basis of consultations with Ulaanbaatar, to withdraw all remaining Soviet troops in Mongolia.

Now let us take a look at the nuclear guided missiles deployed by the Soviet Union on its eastern territory. All the 436 medium- and short-range nuclear guided missiles we deployed there are being destroyed. I would also like to mention that the Soviet Union has undertaken the obligation not to increase any land-based and (?plane carrying) nuclear weapons in the Soviet Asia.

Finally in this connection, I would like to point out that during his recent visit to China, Gorbachev called for joint efforts by our two countries to achieve a certain goal, that is, the total demilitarization of the Soviet-Chinese border, the longest border in the world. On our part, the Soviet Union has indicated its readiness to, on the basis of consultations with China, completely withdraw its troops from the border areas, leaving only ordinary border defense personnel.

In conclusion, (Pereshkov) writes, this undoubtedly is an attainable goal. Realization of the goal will further strengthen the goodneighborly relations between the Soviet Union and China.

PRC Ideological Weakness Jibe Noted

PM2206123589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 4

[Feature incorporating own correspondent Yu. Savenkov report and IZVESTIYA Press Service report under the general heading "Beijing: Life in the City Getting Back to Normal"]

[Text] Beijing—Beijing is still living under martial law, although thousands of servicemen have been withdrawn from the central districts. You are aware of their presence on bridges, at strategic intersections, in the embassy districts, and in areas where foreigners are living.

After the stormy clashes at the beginning of June between troops and the civilian population on the approaches to Tiananmen Square, the Avenue of Eternal Peace is beginning to look like its old self again. Traffic wardens stand on their repaired pedestals with the freshly painted words "safety island."

XINHUA has reported that the first small group of foreign tourists in June has visited the main attraction in the Beijing region, the Great Wall of China. The Bank of

China has reported that foreign currency deposits are gradually returning. At the beginning of June foreign currency transactions were halted in many branches of the Bank of China, which led to the panic withdrawal of investments.

The mail service is gradually returning to normal. Thousands of mail employees are working day and night to clear the backlog that accumulated in the first week of June.

There are also reports that representatives of business firms, some of whom left the capital at the time of the riots, are returning to Beijing. Ren Zhonglin, chief of the State Trade and Industry Administration, has assured all foreign businessmen that their safety and legal rights are guaranteed.

Processes of another kind are also gathering momentum. GUANGMING RIBAO is advocating far greater attention to the problems of patriotic education. An observer from another newspaper, JINGJI RIBAO, believes that "the greatest mistake in the last decade has been inadequate ideological education." This is how Guo Youbing assessed the present political state of society in the newspaper RENMIN RIBAO: The recent serious incidents show that a struggle in society still exists within certain limits and that the slogan "let the world be filled with love" is a naive fantasy. In the commentator's opinion, the riots show that a weakening of ideological work and party leadership and blind emulation of the West lead to anarchy. Some people, the writer continued, used the unrest to plan secret conspiracies to split the party and strike a blow at the socialist republic. In his view, this was not expected by the naive students, who were sincere in their patriotism.

All the central newspapers are publishing the notice from the Supreme People's Court which requires courts at all levels to pass timely sentence on those responsible for the public unrest. The newspapers write that throughout the country the police are continuing their search for people suspected of taking part in the riots and spreading rumors. Many have already been arrested and some are giving themselves up to public security organs.

The press has not given the precise number of people arrested since 4 June.

Foreign agencies report:

The United States has announced new "sanctions" against China. According to White House official spokesman Fitzwater, President G. Bush has given instructions to "temporarily suspend all high-level contacts between the two countries' government officials and announced the administration's intention to try to persuade international financial institutions to delay consideration of the question of granting new loans to China."

The U.S. president had earlier halted arms sales to the PRC as a mark of protest against the Chinese Army's use of force in breaking up the demonstration in Tiananmen Square on 4 June.

According to a statement by a Japanese Foreign Ministry spokesman, the Japanese Government has suspended official aid to China. It has been repeatedly stressed in this respect that "political motives" for this decision should not be sought. According to the Foreign Ministry spokesman, the Japanese Government has no intention of instituting any sanctions against China. The aid program was originally suspended in connection with the threat to Japanese businessmen in the PRC at the time of the tragic events in Tiananmen Square.

A spokesman for the Boeing company has said that the delivery of two Boeing-757 aircraft to the Chinese side is being delayed because the U.S. State Department has imposed a ban on the export of certain types of navigation equipment for these aircraft.

UN Secretary General Perez de Cuellar has appealed to the PRC Government to show mercy to the students, many of whom have been arrested and sentenced to death.

On a visit to Morocco, Perez de Cuellar contacted the UN headquarters in New York and gave instructions for this appeal to be conveyed to Li Luye, PRC permanent representative to the United Nations. He has refrained from criticizing the measures taken by the Chinese leadership against the demonstrators in Tiananmen Square and has described the events in Beijing as a strictly internal affair for China.

A spokesman for the Chrysler corporation said in Detroit that, if the Chinese leadership guarantees the stabilization of the situation in the country, American specialists will begin to return to China this week.

Northeast Asia

Japan's Ambitions for Space Exploration Examined

PM2206103989 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Jun 89 Moscow Edition p 3

[Own correspondent S. Agafonov dispatch: "The Space Round and Japan"]

[Text] Tokyo—A fairly noteworthy event took place in Tokyo this week which did not, however, prompt a broad response from the local mass media because they are more concerned with the problem of the feverish activity of the exchange rate and rather unsavoury forays into the private life of the new prime minister. Meanwhile, the draft law on Japanese participation in a multilateral orbital space station project, approved by the international affairs committee of parliament's lower house, deserves far closer attention than the few paragraphs given to it by the major Japanese newspapers.

Essentially after long years of technological estimates, preliminary research, and small-scale tests of its own potential, Tokyo is officially entering a new round of the competitive race—in space this time. The international nature of the orbital project, in which 12 Western countries will be involved, envisages close cooperation in the development and operation of the future station, but this certainly does not rule out competition between the different parties involved, especially as Japan, for example, is making its contribution to the project in the form of an independent research module to the design of which no one, with the exception of the Japanese themselves, will be privy.

Application for membership of the "space club" has been maturing in Tokyo for a long time, but for decades the Japanese aerospace programs have remained outside public interest and have not been taken seriously either abroad or in Japan itself. Interest was aroused only after the outlines of Japanese "procurements" in the space sphere began to take shape, the scale of these being such that even specialists were thrown into disarray, as it became clear that the country with a "zero space past" was planning specific, successive steps for 30-50 years to come, envisaging, in particular, the launch of its own space "shuttle" along the lines of the U.S. shuttle by the end of the 1990s, followed by the construction of its own orbital station, measures to start "economically opening up the moon," and an expedition to Mars in 2030. Generally speaking, what is interesting is not the list of aims in itself but mainly the fact that, in technological terms, Japan is ready for a space "breakthrough," having as it does 41 satellites in orbit and completing work to fully create a Japanese delivery vehicle for space freight—the N-2 rocket, which will be making its debut in 3 years time.

One could, of course, take a skeptical attitude toward all these facts, especially as the scale of investment in the Japanese space industry is still quite modest and the potential of the sector not as developed as in the United States, for example. However, it seems to me that the key word in Japanese aeronautics has already been said—it is the term "space services," which is cropping up increasingly frequently in the speeches of officials connected with space matters and in press publications on this subject. Tokyo regards outer space not so much as an object of ambition as a colossal untapped market whose development will be one of the main priorities in the years to come. The mass assembly-line production of satellites and their commercial use, orbital hotels, and space "public transport" are certainly no science-fiction fantasy but solid projects on which the Japanese are already working. Against this background, the parliamentary approval of Japan's participation in an international orbital project appears symbolic to a certain extent, but the symbolism is extremely clear, you must agree. It is still too early to judge whether hopes of success in the space round will be realized, but the race has begun.

In this respect it is worth pointing out one vital point which concerns the very heart of the problem. Ten years ago the Japanese parliament passed a special resolution proclaiming the exclusively peaceful nature of Japanese space research. This document is exceptionally relevant now because, first, Tokyo has given the "go-ahead" for participation in the infamous SDI program, which has currently been occupying a back seat but has not been removed from the agenda, and, second, because one aspect of activity of the future orbital station, as the Pentagon admits, will be a series of military research projects and programs in the "security" sphere. In other words, in both instances Japan has acted counter to its own good declarations, sacrificing them to "international cooperation." This arbitrary interpretation of a parliamentary resolution is a fundamental problem, and it is no accident that a bitter discussion surrounds it—which also confirms, incidentally, just how seriously Japanese political and social circles are treating these space ventures.

The last point to be mentioned is the sharp, painful reaction, primarily in the United States, to the Japanese space prospects. Space has yet to become the subject of open, competitive confrontation, but all the signs are there that conflicts over space are going to make themselves greatly felt in the not too distant future. The latest argument in favor of this prediction is the prolonged dispute between Tokyo and Washington over a project for the joint development of a new military fighter aircraft. "The Japanese will not stop at one model—they will create an entire industry"; this is how the American side formulates the main cause of this dispute, and this formula, one feels, will spill over into the sphere of space research sooner rather than later.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Vietnam's Defense Minister Continues Visit

Le Duc Anh Interviewed

PM2706114589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Interview with Army General Le Duc Anh, Vietnamese national defense minister, by own correspondent Senior Lieutenant S. Sidorov: "Guarantee the People's Peaceful Labor"—date and place not specified]

[Text] [Sidorov] What tasks now face the Vietnamese People's Army [VPA]?

[Le Duc Anh] The socialist achievements of the Vietnamese people are extremely dear to us, and for the VPA personnel there is no task more important than that of defending the socialist motherland and defending peace. It is well known that our people have travelled a long path of struggle, privation, and hardships. Consequently, we consider it our duty not only to guarantee their peaceful, creative labor but also to make our own contribution to building socialism.

The VPA must contribute in every way possible to ensuring lasting peace and stability in the region and thereby help to strengthen security throughout the world. In this connection we ardently welcome the defensive military doctrine advanced by the Soviet Union and other Warsaw Pact countries. Its ideas correspond to our own notion of how the world should be—a world in which our country and other countries would live together in friendship and harmony.

[Sidorov] The VPA accumulated enormous combat experience during the years of U.S. aggression in Indochina. Has this experience been generalized and how is it used in troop instruction and the building of the Armed Forces?

[Le Duc Anh] You have touched on a big question. It would be hard to give a brief answer. After all, we are talking about combat experience in both tactics and operations expertise. I will just say that we are continuing to generalize this experience by persistently putting it to use in personnel training and in military-patriotic education for young people.

A characteristic feature of our experience is that, in the broad sense, it is experience in a people's war and not just regular troop operations. We have a saying: "When an enemy enters the house, even the women take up arms." Every Vietnamese must show concern for the defense of the motherland: That is the main lesson we have learned from the period of repelling American aggression.

Our experience has also shown us that, under present conditions, our republic needs a regular army. But it must be a modern army, mainly oriented toward qualitative rather than quantitative parameters of combat potential. That is why we have made the decision, in particular, to reduce the size of our Army personnel.

[Sidorov] At the end of September, the withdrawal of Vietnamese volunteers from Cambodia will be complete, in line with the well-known intergovernmental agreement. Have they totally fulfilled their mission? And what will happen to the officers who return home?

[Le Duc Anh] Cambodia has suffered a terrible tragedy, which has also affected our own people. Many Vietnamese died at the hands of Pol Pot's men. We went to the assistance of our Cambodian comrades to save them from genocide. And now that the Armed Forces of the State of Cambodia have passed through the formative stage and acquired the ability to defend their own country and prevent any repetition of genocide in their land, we have made the decision—in conjunction with the Cambodian leaders—to withdraw our own troops. The withdrawal will be complete by the end of September.

The war in Indochina has lasted decades, and Soviet people well understand what this war has meant for us. Our soldiers and officers have no greater wish than to live with their family and friends, work in peaceful conditions, and build socialism in the land of Vietnam.

[Sidorov] How do you assess the situation in the region in light of the continuing contacts between representatives of the State of Cambodia, the Khmer armed opposition, and countries with an interest in settling the conflict as soon as possible?

[Le Duc Anh] Governments and political figures with a conscience cannot have an interest in the kind of situation being created where Pol Pot policies could be repeated. We hope that future events will develop on this basis. We believe that reason will ultimately prevail and that aid to reactionary forces guilty of crimes against their own people will end. The people of Cambodia will then be able to concentrate on building their own future.

[Sidorov] What is your opinion of U.S. military activity in Southeast Asia?

[Le Duc Anh] Obviously, U.S. military activity in this region affects not only our own interests but also the interests of other countries, the Soviet Union included. There is still a U.S. military presence in the Philippines. Joint U.S.-Thai military maneuvers are conducted every year. These factors should be considered from every angle and their study continued.

One would like to see the trend toward detente which has appeared in the region gain the upper hand and those forces of reaction and war, which are pursuing other aims, be forced to take account of peoples' aspirations. We are a peace-loving nation and peace is dear to us. But we must also show great vigilance with regard to the plans of reactionaries in the region.

[Sidorov] After a long break, contacts have resumed at government level between the SRV and the PRC. How will this affect the situation in the Vietnamese-Chinese border region and the development of relations between the two countries as a whole?

[Le Duc Anh] Traditionally friendly relations have existed for a long time between the Chinese and Vietnamese peoples. Indeed, our peoples have retained feelings of friendship for one another. The essence of these feelings has remained unchanged. Normal relations were simply artificially broken off. We have always regarded this as a temporary phenomenon.

We are presently seeking ways to normalize Vietnamese-Chinese relations. We must believe that Beijing also realizes the need for rapprochement. Steps are now being taken to remove the barriers dividing our countries. I believe that normal relations between China and Vietnam and between our parties will be restored.

We attach great significance to M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the PRC, which signaled the normalization of Soviet-Chinese relations. This fact will undoubtedly have a positive impact on the development of peaceful processes in the Asian and Pacific region and will contribute in particular to the earliest possible restoration of relations of good-neighborliness and friendship between China and Vietnam, which particularly pleases us.

I would like to stress that the normalization of Vietnamese-Chinese relations answers the hopes of Vietnamese communists and our Armed Forces personnel.

[Sidorov] What are the results of your visit to the Soviet Union?

[Le Duc Anh] I visited your country at the invitation of Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, and was officially his guest. But speaking more broadly we regard this visit as a meeting with like-minded people who share our ideas and views on building a society of social justice.

With regard to our talks in the USSR Defense Ministry, I must say that we did not differ on any of the questions we discussed. Total unity of views was apparent during the conversations. The frank, cordial atmosphere of the meetings with Soviet officials allowed us to discuss a very broad range of problems.

Arrives in Volgograd

LD2406163289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 24 Jun 89

[Excerpt] Army General Le Duc Anh, member of the Politburo of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee and the country's national defense minister, who is in the Soviet Union on an official friendly visit at the invitation of Army General Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee and USSR defense minister, left Moscow today for a journey around our country. The guest from Vietnam has arrived in Volgograd. [passage omitted]

Leaves To Tour USSR

PM2806094189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Touring The Country"]

[Text] On 24 June Army General Le Duc Anh, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam Central Committee Politburo and SRV national defense minister, who is on an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union at the invitation of Army General D.T. Yazov, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR defense minister, left on a tour of the country.

There was an official farewell ceremony at Sheremetyevo Airport. Army Gen Le Duc Anh was seen off by Army Gen D.T. Yazov; USSR Deputy Defense Ministers Army General I.M. Tretyak, Marshal of Aviation A.N. Yefimov, Admiral of the Fleet V.N. Chernavin, and other officials.

Also there to see him off were Nguyen Manh Cam, SRV ambassador to the Soviet Union, and Do Van Phuc, military attache at the SRV Embassy in the Soviet Union.

The state flags of the SRV and the Soviet Union were flying at the airport, an honor guard made up of Moscow Garrison troops was drawn up on the runway, and the two countries' national anthems were played.

The guest is accompanied on his tour of the country by Army General M.I. Sorokin, USSR deputy defense minister.

Rogachev Discusses Soviet Asian Policy

BK2206143489 Hong Kong AFP in English 1420 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] Jakarta, June 22 (AFP)—Moscow's ties with Indonesia are entering a new stage and will continue to improve, supported by the Kremlin's "new thinking," Soviet Deputy Foreign Minister Igor Rogachev said in an interview published here Thursday.

Mr Rogachev, who oversees Soviet policy in the Far East, told the INDONESIAN OBSERVER that Moscow was playing down ideological issues and would not interfere in the internal affairs of other states.

Speaking in Moscow with the newspaper's chief editor, Taufik Darusman, Mr Rogachev said the Soviet people had a very positive view of Indonesia.

"They remember Indonesia from the days of (the late President) Sukarno," he said, apparently referring to the very close ties in the 1950s and early 1960s when Moscow was the largest supplier of arms and aid to Jakarta.

Relations took a nose-dive in 1965 when in the aftermath of an abortive coup attempt the Indonesian Communist Party was wiped out and the staunchly anti-communist President Suharto came to power.

Indonesia froze diplomatic relations with China in 1967, accusing Beijing of complicity in the coup but the two sides agreed in February to begin talks on restoring formal ties, apparently over the objections of some senior military officers here who remain deeply suspicious of Chinese motives in the region.

Analysts said at the time that Mr Suharto might have wanted to "bring into play the China card" as the two communist powers moved to normalise relations soured since the 1960s and ahead of his planned visit to Moscow this year.

Since the 1965 coup the Soviet Union has played a very cautious game in Indonesia, the world's fifth largest nation which sits astride the major sea arteries between the Pacific and Indian oceans, observers said.

They also recalled Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev's exclusive interview in the OBSERVER'S sister publication, the MERDEKA daily, in 1987, explaining Moscow's new policy in the Far East aimed at settling regional conflicts and claiming a major role for the Soviet Union in the region.

"We are optimistic that relations will improve in the future," Mr Rogachev said, adding that Moscow highly appreciated Indonesia's "positive role" in the non-aligned movement and its efforts to find a solution to the Cambodian conflict.

Mr Rogachev said he hoped very much that Mr Suharto would come to Moscow, taking up a long-standing invitation to make his first ever visit there.

Mr Suharto originally planned to go this month but put off the trip when the Soviet authorities said Mr Gorbachev would only be able to see him in July because of the pressure of work.

Foreign Minister Ali Alatas visited Moscow earlier this month and discussed preparations for the president's trip.

In a bid to further strengthen relations, Mr Rogachev said Moscow had invited Indonesian observers to take part in a Soviet naval exercise in the Sea of Japan next month. "Indonesia's participation as an observer would be a sign of both sides' willingness to increase bilateral ties," he added.

The OBSERVER quoted the Indonesian ambassador to Moscow as saying that there had been no official reply yet. Officials here could not be contacted Thursday for comment on the reported proposal.

PRAVDA Describes Cambodia Scene

PM2206103189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p4

[Article by own correspondent P. Tsvetov: "Laos: Year 2532"]

[Excerpt] [Passage omitted] For the people of Laos, the white, albino elephant is a kind of talisman, a symbol of imminent fortune. At the beginning of the new year, "Pi May," a live talisman is led out in full array into the streets of Vientiane for all to see. The lucky ones even get to touch the elephant. It is then led back into the heart of the forest. This attitude toward superstition is perfectly natural in a country where a considerable proportion of the population is trained in Buddhist monasteries.

Change in the Economy

Changes in Lao life are not wrought by miraculous phenomena and do not take place overnight. They are the result of theoretical study and practical action. The Fourth Lao People's Revolutionary Party [LPRP] Congress in 1986 analyzed the lessons of the first decade of the republic's development and substantiated the need for comprehensive renewal. A practical start to this was made by the Fifth and Sixth LPRP Central Committee Plenums, held in 1988. The decisions they adopted envisage changing the structure of the economy in order to transform noncommodity production into commodity production.

The task of putting an end to patriarchal, subsistence farming was set immediately after the proclamation of the people's democratic republic. But attempts to make such a leap on the basis of developing the state and collective sectors failed to produce the desired results. Consequently, the Fifth LPRP Central Committee Plenum drew the conclusion that it would be more correct to make the transition to building socialism via the development of commodity production. As a whole, the present stage is described by party documents as the stage of improving the people's democratic system and making a gradual transition to building socialism. It is assumed that the country's economy will be multistructured for a comparatively long time to come.

What should play a decisive role in the attainment of these aims? In the opinion of Lao theorists—a combination of personal, collective, and public interests. In practice the emphasis is being placed on the first part of the formula. Laos is now doing its utmost to galvanize personal interest and increase everyone's contribution to the common cause. That is why the family has been pronounced as the main link. The family of the agricultural worker, handicraftsman, trader, employee, and worker.

People are now mainly counting on rural areas in the country's development. A substantial proportion of society's forces and resources are being placed at their disposal. In practice, the implementation of this course signifies the following. Land is now allocated to peasant families and also to workers and employees, for them to run the farms at their disposal, with the right to pass the property on through inheritance. The state levies a tax in return for this. This means that a considerable proportion of land has gained specific owners, who have an interest in using it zealously.

In foreign trade the new course envisages an "open-doors" policy. The "Law on Foreign Investments in the Lao People's Democratic Republic," which offers preferential terms for foreign investors, was passed last year.

The time that has passed since the LPRP announced its new economic strategy makes it possible to sum up the initial results, which is precisely what the Seventh LPRP Central Committee Plenum held at the beginning of this year did. The party confirmed its determination to continue with its planned course. In 1988 production and circulation became more lively, there was an increase in commodity output, and ties between the city and the countryside broadened considerably. A direct consequence of the new economic policy is growth in labor productivity in agriculture, primarily in those regions where the lease is widespread practice. This has left its mark. In other years, the unfavorable weather conditions of 1988 would certainly have led to a sharp deterioration in the country's food situation. That did not happen this time, despite the fact that the plan indicators were not secured.

At the same time—and this, too, was noted at the plenum—not everything is going as planned. The slogan of combining personal, collective, and public interests is still not being wholly realized in practice. Personal interest has been interpreted by some as a chance to get rich quick by any means. As a result, many workers, employees, and peasants have begun to trade on the market, abandoning their machine tools, desks, and plows and exploiting market conditions and personal ties with Thailand. A considerable proportion of monetary assets are circulating within the trade network and are not being channeled into the production sphere. Private business activity still rarely extends to production.

The Seventh LPRP Central Committee Plenum described 1989 as a decisive year for implementing the resolutions of the fifth and sixth plenums. The state is planning to focus special efforts on building such projects as the Seset [name as published] hydroelectric power station, a bridge over the river Sedone, highways No 8, 13, and 20, a sugar refinery, a party school, and a circus in Vientiane. Most of these projects are being built with assistance from the Soviet Union.

For Peace and Friendship

The year 1989 has a chance to be an important landmark in the history of state building in Laos. March 26 saw the first general elections to the highest body of authority, the Supreme People's Assembly, in the history of the republic. The first session of the new parliament was held at the end of May. Its main task was to adopt the first constitution in the history of Laos. The LPRP has drawn the important conclusion that the modern-day Lao state is a "people's democracy gradually taking the path of socialism."

On my first visit to Laos I could feel tension. There was a sense of unease on all borders, with the exception of the border with Vietnam. The Thai authorities had once again closed the 1,635-kilometer border and essentially cut Laos off from a considerable proportion of the world market, Laos having no outlet to the sea. (The route via the Vietnamese port of Da Nang was not sufficiently reliable). And, in 1979, the border with China could also not be described as good-neighborly.

The positive changes in the international climate could not fail to affect Laos. The move taking place in world politics away from confrontation toward detente took on real substance here in 1988. Last year saw a move away from confrontation toward cooperation in Lao-Thai relations. In January, shells were still exploding in the border region of Botene, but in November the new prime minister of the Kingdom of Thailand, Chatchai Chunhawan, visited Laos and, as a result of his talks with Kaysone Phomvihane, general secretary of the LPRP Central Committee and chairman of the Lao Council of Ministers, relations were normalized. The sides signed a joint declaration, which stresses the two peoples' desire to live in peace and good neighborliness.

In late 1987 - early 1988, the process of improving Lao-Chinese relations was stepped up. The sides signed an agreement on economic issues and protocols on commodity exchange and border trade.

With the elimination of the Pol Pot regime of genocide, peace and good-neighborliness have been established along the border between Laos and Cambodia. Relations between the three Indochinese states—Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia—are traditionally described as "special." They are special because, for many decades, all three states have been the object of combined aggression from French colonizers, Japanese militarists, and American imperialists.

Today the alliance of the three Indochinese peoples is primarily directed toward finding a just solution to the Cambodian problem, eliminating the hotbed of tension in Southeast Asia, and improving the situation in the region. The three states are collaborating to these ends.

The special hopes pinned on the year 2532, now begun, are not in vain. It could become the year that peace is established in Southeast Asia as a result of a solution being found to the Cambodian problem and the year that important changes are made in the Lao national economy and in the life of every Lao family. Lao communists and the country's people are now striving and working for this.

Near East & South Asia

POW Exchange Discussed at Islamabad Talks

LD2706165789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1605 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Islamabad, 27 Jun (TASS)—At the fourth round of talks between representatives of the Soviet Embassy and the Afghan armed opposition, which took place on

26 June in the Pakistani Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Islamabad, on the question of the liberation of Soviet military servicemen seized in Afghanistan by antigovernment forces (?the sides) reached agreement on certain questions. In particular, the delegation of the armed opposition stated its readiness to permit access to Soviet military servicemen who are in the hands of the mujahidin by representatives of the International Red Cross.

The Soviet side at the meeting agreed to consider the opposition's proposal on the exchange of all Soviet soldiers and officers seized in Afghanistan for muahidin who are imprisoned in Afghan territory.

Afghanistan's Wakil Leaves Moscow After Stopover
LD2506154989 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1015 GMT 25 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 25 June (TASS)—Afghanistan's Foreign Affairs Minister 'Abdul Wakil, who was passing through Moscow from Kabul, left for the Hague on Saturday for the conference of the Nonaligned Movement "Peace and International Law."

He was seen off at the airport by Boris Chaplin, USSR deputy foreign affairs minister, as well as Afghanistan's ambassador to the USSR Sayd Muhammad Gulabzoy.

El Al Plane Carries Armenian Victims to Israel
LD2706200589 Moscow TASS in English 1606 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] New York June 27 TASS—A plane of the Israeli air company El Al flew from Tel Aviv to Yerevan today. It will take on board in the Armenian capital 66 people injured during the recent earthquake that claimed the lives of thousands of people. They will undergo medical treatment at the clinics of Tel Aviv and Haifa. Those with amputated limbs will be provided with prosthetic appliances manufactured in Israel, the ASSOCIATED PRESS news agency reports. It has been reported that the New York-based American-Jewish charity committee that organised the El Al flight and medical treatment for the quake victims raised 500,000 dollars for the relief fund.

PLO's 'Abbas on Soviet-Palestinian Committee
LD1906171389 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1445 GMT 19 Jun 89

[From "The World Today" program, presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov: interview with PLO Executive Committee member Mahmud 'Abbas, alias Abu Mazin, by unidentified correspondent, "a few days ago"; place not given—recorded; interview conducted in Arabic with Seyful-Mulyukov providing superimposed Russian translation throughout]

[Text] [Correspondent] What tasks is the PLO tackling now, following the recent Arab summit in Casablanca?

['Abbas] First of all, I would like to note that the Arab countries unanimously approved the PLO's peace strategy, which was adopted at the 19th Session of the Palestine National Council. The coordination of our actions with the Arab world is of exceptionally great importance. The leaders of the Arab states, at their emergency meeting in Casablanca, adopted the decision to give the Palestinian people all around support in their just struggle. A special committee was formed which will establish contacts with the permanent members of the UN Security Council, with the aim of speeding up the process of settling the Palestinian problem. Furthermore, the participants in the Casablanca meeting decided to support the Palestinian uprising in the occupied lands by giving them the necessary financial help. Measures also are being taken for convening an international conference on the Middle East, aimed at achieving an all-embracing settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

[Correspondent] How would you describe the development of the intifadah [uprising] 18 months after it began?

['Abbas] The intifadah has become part of the life of the Palestinian people. They are full of resolution to see it continue for the sake of achieving the task it has set: giving the Palestinians the right to self-determination. Those taking part in the intifadah use the widest possible arsenal of peaceful methods in their struggle against the occupiers: demonstrations, strikes, and resistance to the Israeli troops. The widest possible strata of the Palestinian population are taking part in this uprising: workers, peasants, women, and traders. We consider that the uprising will continue until such time as our people achieve the liberation of Palestinian lands from Israeli occupation.

[Correspondent] Recently there has been noticeable progress in approaches to a settlement of the Palestinian problem. The official dialogue between the PLO and the United States is continuing. How would you evaluate this?

['Abbas] There are several factors that have brought the United States to hold official contacts with the Palestinian leadership, first and foremost our multilateral links with many countries in the West, particularly in Western Europe, and the almost complete understanding of the Palestinian problem that has been achieved. As for the United States, until recently, they simply did not recognize the existence of the Palestinian people, nor did they recognize the PLO. Now the situation has changed. Washington has been forced to recognize that the Palestinian people have legitimate rights, and that these rights are defended by the PLO, with which it is necessary to talk. So far, it is too early to speak of specific results from the dialogue. The important thing is that it is continuing, and that fundamental questions of a settlement are being discussed. We are optimistic about being able to convince the Americans to change their position in the future, and to have a more objective attitude toward the

problem of a Middle East settlement. We are not demanding that the United States have some sort of special attitude toward the Palestinian people; we want them to give up their support for the aggressive Israeli actions against our people.

[Correspondent] The Western press reports that Washington is demanding that the PLO agree to the so-called Shamir plan for elections in the occupied territories. What is your opinion?

['Abbas] We made clear our position with regard to the Shamir initiative at the Casablanca conference of Arab leaders. They supported it. In principle, we agree with the idea of elections. We are prepared to agree to these elections, even in the occupied territories, if the following three conditions are observed: The elections must be free and democratic, and directly connected with a plan for a peace settlement; that is to say, both the beginning and the end must be known, but we will not accept elections for the sake of elections, even more so if they aim to strengthen the occupation regime.

[Correspondent] How do you see the Soviet position on the questions of a Middle East settlement?

['Abbas] The Soviet Union has a principled position. It stands on the side of the just cause of the Palestinian people, and believes in their right to self-determination, to the creation of their own independent state. The USSR works actively at all levels to see the Palestinians achieve these rights. A settlement in the Middle East must provide for the establishment of a just and stable peace on the basis of ensuring the rights of all states and peoples of the region, equal security, independent existence, and development. This applies to both the Arabs, including the Palestinians, and to Israel. A Soviet-Palestinian committee on the Middle East has been set up, which has become an important instrument to coordinate our joint efforts. Even those who until recently rejected the constructive role of the USSR in the Middle East now are convinced that a solution to the Middle East, the Palestinian problem, can be found only with the active participation of your country. The Soviet initiatives meet with a positive response in the Arab countries and throughout the world community.

More on Indian Commerce Minister's Visit

Meets With Lukyanov, Biryukova

PM2206091989 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 21 Jun 89 Second Edition p4

[TASS report under general heading "Friendly Conversations"]

[Text] A.I. Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet and candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, received Indian Commerce Minister D. Singh in the Kremlin 20 June.

Questions of the further development and deepening of Soviet-Indian relations and also a number of international prolems of mutual interest were discussed.

On the same day A.P. Biryukova, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, received D. Singh.

They discussed questions of further developing and deepening Soviet-Indian trade and economic cooperation, including in the sphere of consumer goods production.

The sides noted the need to galvanize work to implement existing agreements and develop new forms of cooperation, such as setting up joint enterprises, organizing production cooperation, and establishing direct ties between Indian firms and Soviet enterprises.

K.F. Katushev, USSR minister of foreign economic relations, took part in the conversation.

T.N. Kaul, Indian ambassador to the USSR, took part in both meetings.

Joint Ventures Agreed Upon

BK2206160989 Delhi Domestic Service in English 1530 GMT 22 Jun 89

[Text] India and the Soviet Union have agreed to strengthen bilateral trade and economic ties through new forms of cooperation. Both sides agreed to remove bottlenecks in setting up of joint ventures through a mechanism of the new working group set up recently. This was agreed at the discussions the commerce minister, Mr Dinesh Singh, had with the Soviet leaders in Moscow.

An official press release said in New Delhi that an agreement has also been reached on the expansion of infrastructural facilities for shipping, air transport, and railways to boost the bilateral trade. A new working group has been set up to consider the problems in these areas.

An Indian trade center is to be set up in Moscow and a Soviet center in New Delhi to promote bilateral trade in small and medium industrial sector. The press release said, seven joint venture proposals have already been approved and another 10 are in the pipeline.

Correction to Military Agreement With Iran

The following correction pertains to the item headlined "Details of Military Agreement With Iran Noted," published in the 27 June Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 21:

make sourceline read: Abu Dhabi AL-ITTIHAD in Arabic 26 Jun 89 pp 1, 21 (correcting date)

Africa

Soviet Foreign Aid Projects in Africa Criticized

18070319 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
20 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 5

[Article by B. Pilyatskin in Maputu: "Bitter Pills Provide Better Cure"]

[Text] During the almost 3 decades of our active presence in Africa the edifice of Soviet-African relations has been built almost from the ground (before World War II there were only three sovereign countries on the political map of the continent); a ramified system of political, economic, cultural, and in some places military ties has been arranged. Now the number of Soviet people working on the African continent and enlisted in the sphere of mutual interests runs into the thousands, and there are thousands of emissaries of the young independent countries of Africa who have been given the opportunity to study and master various occupations in our country.

How does all this tie in with the capabilities and needs of our economy? After all, it is no secret that from the very beginning we have had to deal with the fact that Africa and poverty, alas, are two sides of the same coin and this means that we were faced with the problem of giving aid to our new friends. At the beginning of the year IZVESTIYA printed a letter from the reader S. Andrusenko from Ulan-Ude. "I am an internationalist," he wrote, "and I consider it correct that we give certain poorly developed countries not only political but also economic support. But the people do not know what sums this support costs the country." He goes on to raise the question: "Are we not too involved in helping other countries to the detriment of our own interests, the interests of the Soviet people?" This topic was also raised in certain speeches at the Congress of People's Deputies.

I would answer like this: In places where we are talking about scientifically substantiated plans for cooperation that meet essential needs on a compensatory basis, the advantage is mutual, and the money and labor that are invested produce real fruits. But it is altogether different when the real cause takes a second place to a passion for projects and a departmental wish to use any means to "stake a claim" to presence without taking into account the real needs of those who have asked for assistance. Alas, there are examples. Take the project for the Limpopo—a narrow river that flows along the Mozambique valley and empties into the Indian Ocean. At the end of the seventies representatives of the all-union production association Soyuzovdproyekt descended upon this area.

Responding to the call of the editors, at that time I wrote a premature article entitled "How the Limpopo is Being Tamed," for which I am doing my penance. For the sake of fairness I must note that I figured out what was what fairly soon after the publication of the article but it was too late; in those days it was not permitted to refute any article. But the essence of the problem was this. Before Mozambique's independence the extremely fertile Limpopo valley served as the country's grain bin. The mechanized plantations of white farmers who used the cheap labor of the Africans produced enormous harvests of rice, feed crops, vegetables, and fruits. Even taking into account the periodic floods and droughts, this was a region of highly profitable agriculture. The Portuguese farmers were able to count money and developed plans for utilizing the water of the Limpopo for the next millennium. The downfall of the empire spoiled these plans and the bulging files of plans and numerical computations lay on the shelves. The natives of Mozambique, having laid their hands on these ledgers, decided to consult with us.

What was required of the educated and conscientious specialists? To explain to their comrades from Mozambique that the solution to the problem of the "technical and economic utilization of the waters of the Limpopo River after the year 2000" (this was the name of the Portuguese plan) in and of itself, of course, was possible. But under conditions whereby the young republic literally from its first steps began to suffocate from economic difficulties and confusion, it was clearly untimely, since it would bring no practical immediate advantage to Mozambique. And its task, I repeat, was to survive, to hold on just for today.

And a group of specialists from the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources arrived here in the health resort city of Xai-Xai at the mouth of the Limpopo. Having settled into comfortable little cottages, they established a subsidiary farm and, in no hurry, they began to work their way through the Portuguese archives. After several years had passed and it had become clear that the people sent to Mozambique were wasting public money, the embassy party committee and the public raised their voices. I shall not remind you again that in those years this required a certain amount of courage because the demagogic unwritten rule that "Moscow can see better" removed all questions that were raised about the "tamers" of the Limpopo. I recall how one of the leaders of the USSR Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources flew in on an inspection mission and flew out satisfied with his subordinates.

So much has already been written about the ministry which almost diverted the northern rivers and caused an ecological catastrophe, but our readers can now know that there they gave their blessing to similar activity and they carried it out abroad, wasting the currency the country needed so much. The Limpopo was no match. At one time in the bosom of this same Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources they were considering the question of flooding...the Sahara Desert, but the Africans thought better of it just in time.

Years later I am trying to find the "ends" of the inglorious time the group of planners spent sitting in the cozy little Mozambique health resort. The "cabinet of the Limpopo Valley" was eliminated long ago and the

Mozambique comrades I asked about what happened to the multivolume "work" left by the people from the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources look away confused. S. Andrusenko and other readers are right to raise the issue that allocations for foreign economic aid should not be unmonitored. If consideration of the financing of the plan for the "assimilation" of the Limpopo had taken place publicly in the corresponding commission of the Soviet parliament, such a thing would hardly have happened.

Recently the Maputu newspaper NOTICIAS published an article about Mozambique-Soviet economic ties and cited a figure: Mozambique's debt to the Soviet Union is R1.6 billion ($2.5 billion). Although this figure seems fairly questionable, it is not always possible to obtain an answer concerning the actual expenditures of our funds or—more importantly—the economic expediency of the expenditures that were made. This generates not only confusion but also a legitimate desire to know the truth, to have the opportunity to express one's judgment about the decisions that were made to allot public money to render assistance to foreign countries from our budget which was strained to begin with.

"A bitter pill provides the best treatment." This folk saying is quite applicable to such a sphere as mutual economic relations between the USSR and the countries of Africa. We shall not hide our head in the sand and deny the obvious: During years past many useful and necessary objects have been created in the African countries. This list includes the Aswan Dam, the gas lines in Libya and Algeria, the Guinean bauxite mining complex, and the Blanche Gomez maternity hospital in Brazzaville. I just named the first things that came to mind. Our specialists—doctors and teachers, geologists and agronomists, and representatives of other professions, frequently in the backwoods in the scorching heat, in the malaria-filled swamps, torn away not only from their homeland but also from their embassies, under the most difficult living conditions (there are the foreign countries for you!), without complaint, not counting on glory or even gratitude—have done and are doing their work. All this is the truth. But only part of it. And the story of the "assimilation" of the Limpopo, unfortunately, is not a unique exception. We must speak of this and discuss it openly in order not to repeat the mistakes and blunders of the past.

I am writing about Mozambique where IZVESTIYA opened up a correspondence point as early as 1977. The collective of Soviet specialists helping the republic in various areas of economics and culture is one of the largest in Africa. But here is a fact for contemplation: During all the years of our cooperation—and this is almost a decade and a half—we have not constructed a single industrial or agricultural facility here. Of course, the difficult military and political situation in the region has had an effect, making it impossible to develop large-scale cooperation. But we must not remain silent about certain shortcomings where competence and depth of study of the problem have been replaced by immediate considerations and gestures for show.

Thus upon one of the trips to Moscow by the late president Samora Machel, Leonid Ilich out of the "generosity of his soul" was about to give the distant country a metallurgical plant. But, fortunately, even the people who came up with this rash idea, when they began to study the situation in the local area, came to the conclusion that without sources of raw material or the corresponding sales market the enterprise would not be viable, would operate at a loss, and was simply unnecessary. We thank them for saving the people's money. But the overbearing idea was clothed in another variant—a plant for agricultural implements.

The story which, it would seem, should have culminated in a more or less favorable finale lasted for 12 years. The plant in Beira had already begun to produce (no, not agricultural equipment) metal dishes and when its first section goes into operation in October it will begin to produce hoes. In March 1987 after the contract for the delivery of the basic equipment was finally signed, through the efforts of the embassy and the trade delegation, which "put pressure" on the corresponding departments in the Union for them to accelerate the dispatch, steamships began to arrive in Beira ahead of schedule.

But for about 10 years before that there was a chain of endless negotiations and renegotiations, reprojecting, and recalculating the economic indicators of the enterprise in connection with the essential change of its profile. The Soviet comrades working in Mozambique today must pay for the mistakes made during the times of stagnation and make up for the years lost by their predecessors.

This and other long-uncompleted construction projects bring to mind the idea that the principle we adopted many years ago of rendering assistance to developing countries under the conditions of so-called technical assistance has not been justified in the majority of countries of Africa. For it is based on the idea that the USSR should supply equipment and materials and also send its specialists to install and adjust this equipment. All the local people are responsible for are the construction work and subsequent organization of production and management. But because they lack experience and the necessary means, these commitments, as a rule, are not fulfilled promptly, which leads to a failure to meet construction deadlines. Moreover the equipment we have delivered frequently rots and becomes unusable under the conditions of the tropical climate. As a result, the Soviet side sustains additional losses for restoring it, increasing the cost of construction, not to mention its level, which does damage to Soviet prestige in its cooperation with developing countries.

Has the time not come to take a critical look at the entire picture of our economic ties with Africa and to determine for the future a realistically weighed and, of course, mutually advantageous program of action. And if decisions are made concerning the construction of one facility or another, this should be "turnkey" construction in close coordination with the local raw material base and training of indigenous personnel for future operation. And if we deny our partners some particular thing, there is no need to be frightened or dramatize this because today we are saying openly and honestly: Our capabilities are not unlimited and everything we are doing and all the ways in which we are helping must be understood and approved by our people.

The new thinking in the approach to financial problems associated with the economic and political realities of Africa is not an abstraction; it is already being manifested in practice, although out of inertia we sometimes silence our voices as soon as the subject comes around to economizing somewhere other than home. Here is a recent example. Along with other members of the Security Council our country determined the number of people in the UN contingent in Namibia in keeping with the monetary capabilities of this organization, which includes significant sums from the USSR budget. Not everyone in Africa liked this decision and critical voices rang out. I do not think anything was said about it in our press. And that is a pity. For Soviet diplomacy had a right to be proud of the event that occurred: We acted not like merchants out for a buck but on the basis of real possibilities, cooperating with other permanent members of the Security Council in providing a start for the entire process of the decolonization of Namibia, for the sake of which, actually, hundreds of millions of dollars were allocated.

The confusion I mentioned ensues to a significant degree from the era when it was thought: There simply could be no disagreements with "peace-loving Africa" (a cliche that found a permanent home on the pages of newspapers and magazines).

One could abuse the Americans or the British in any way and as much as one wished, but God forbid that we write anything that was not very flattering about a resident of the Black continent. In a situation of self-deception and with the existence of preconceived stereotypes for all occasions in life, in a false atmosphere of compulsory cultivation of friendship we were not supposed to see the slightest thing negative in the lives of these young countries.

The French scholar (A. Dyumon) in the 1960's published his remarkable book "Black Africa is Beginning Poorly" while our only scapegoat was the leader from Katanga and then for a short time the prime minister of the long-suffering Congo, Moise Tshombe—"a renegade, collaborationist" and, of course, "a CIA agent." With respect to the ulcers of corruption, nepotism, and dictatorial tendencies that began more and more appreciably to infect the young organisms of the African states, the appearance of happy silence prevailed.

The contrast with the past is especially great when it is compared with the present activity of Soviet diplomacy which is searching for new, nonstandard approaches to add dynamism, stability, and real mutual advantage to relations with African countries. Real economic results will not appear in one day but it is important to see the future and predict it correctly. And the political advantage for Africa and the entire world from the Sovietn Union's constructive assistance in solving the Namibian problem is appreciable even today.

The main obstacle on the path to this goal is the RSA's [Republic of South Africa] apartheid, which has changed in recent years and been truncated but continues as before to have spreading roots in the entire sociopolitical structure of the superpower of the African continent. But one cannot but note that the RSA has not stood to the side of the change in the overall international climate, mainly in its mutual relations with its neighbors. As concerns internal affairs, the doctrine of apartheid has been officially recognized to be groundless in the RSA, and those who are at the helm of the state declare their intentions to tear down the system of racial discrimination. The whole question is how much time this will take.

It would seem that the dogmatic blinders and the penchant for stereotypes have frequently made our view of this country too simplistic and one-dimensional.

We now understand that even the most severe condemnation of apartheid cannot replace a serious analysis. Incidentally, the African countries, above all frontline Mozambique, are reacting quite flexibly and constructively to the changing situation in the region, which is shown by the expansion of political contacts and economic ties between Maputu and Pretoria.

I wrote about this not so long ago in an article entitled "One Does Not Choose One's Neighbors" (IZVESTIYA, No 62) and described the real state of affairs. But then in Maputu I received a letter from a Muscovite, V. Tetekin, who categorically disagrees with me. Naturally, everyone has a right to his own view. Unfortunately, claiming to have the only truth and being unwilling to even tolerate the idea of a polemic, the reader finds the simplest solution: Stop printing "fallacious" articles that do not correspond to his, Tetekin's, understanding of events. What can one say to this? We have paid too dearly for our past lies, our game of blind man's buff, and our refusal to have anything to do with reality: "Keep away from me!" can in no way fit today within the contours of the new thinking and the creative interpretation of the changes taking place in Africa and throughout the world.

...Do we really need Africa so much? A continent where five-tenths of the sovereign countries included in the Organization of African Unity and the Nonaligned Movement are creating their own lives for today and tomorrow, a unique storehouse of flora and fauna preserved from prehistoric times, a treasure house of original culture. Africa is a part of our awareness and being; without it universal harmony would break into pieces. I write this without diminishing the merits of other regions and I wish to end with the words of Ernest Hemingway whom nobody would suspect of a lack of patriotism: "There is nothing better than Africa, just as there is nothing better than youth and love."

East Europe

GDR's Honecker Arrives on Working Visit

Met by Yakovlev, Others

LD2706171589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1640 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow 27 June (TASS)—Erich Honecker, general secretary of the SED [Socialist Unity Party of Germany] Central Committee and chairman of the GDR State Council, arrived in Moscow today for a working visit at the invitation of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

He was met at the airport by Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Valentin Falin, chief of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee; and other officials. Also in the welcoming party was Gerd Koenig, GDR ambassador to the USSR.

The GDR and USSR state flags were raised at the airport.

More on Reception, Activities

LD2706161689 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1536 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State, arrived in Moscow this evening for a working visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee. On arrival at Vnukovo airport, Erich Honecker, and his party were cordially welcomed by Aleksandr Yakovlev, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and other leading figures.

Tomorrow, Erich Honecker will meet Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, for a talk in the Central Committee building. After a dinner in the Kremlin, he will fly to Magnitogorsk to take part in celebrations marking the city's 60th anniversary.

Erich Honecker was seen off at Berlin-Schoenefeld airport by members of the state and party leadership. Vyacheslav Kochemasov, Soviet ambassador to the GDR, was also present.

Among those accompanying Erich Honecker were the members of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany Central Committee Oskar Fischer, minister of foreign affairs; Guenter Sieber, head of the International Affairs Department in the Central Committee; and Secretary of State Frank-Joachim Herrmann, head of the Chancellery of the State Council Chairman.

Plenary Talks View Cooperation

LD2806095989 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 0921 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—Erich Honecker, general secretary of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee and chairman of the GDR Council of State, and Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, met for detailed talks this morning in the headquarters of the Supreme Soviet in the Kremlin in Moscow.

The focus of the exchange of opinions was joint tasks for the further deepening of the fraternal relations between the GDR and the USSR as well as topical questions of close cooperation in the international arena.

Foreign Minister Oskar Fischer, State Secretary Frank-Joachim Herrmann, who is head of the chancellery of the chairman of the State Council; Guenter Sieber, head of the Central Committee International Affairs Department, and Gerd Koenig, ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary of the GDR in the USSR, all members of the SED Central Committee, participated in the talks. On the Soviet side, Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister; Valentin Falin, member of the CPSU Central Committee and head of the Central Committee International Department; Rafael Fedorov, deputy head of the Central Committee International Department; and Georgiy Shakhazarov, adviser to the general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, were present.

Erich Honecker arrived yesterday in Moscow for his working visit at the invitation of the CPSU Central Committee.

This afternoon Erich Honecker and his entourage will fly on to Magnitogorsk to participate in the festivities to mark the 60th anniversary of the foundation of the steel workers' city.

Gorbachev, Central Committee Host Lunch

LD2806113989 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1042 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—The CPSU Central Committee gave a luncheon today in honor of Erich Honecker, Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee general secretary and GDR State Council chairman.

At this gathering in the Kremlin's Catherine Hall, Mikhail Gorbachev, CPSU Central Committee general secretary and USSR Supreme Soviet chairman, once more greeted his guest and the latter's entourage most heartily.

Other USSR party and state leadership officials took part in the luncheon at the conclusion of Erich Honecker's working visit to Moscow. Present were CPSU Central Committee Politburo members Nikolay Ryzhkov—Ministers Council chairman—Aleksandr Yakovlev, Vadim Medvedev, and Nikolay Slyunkov—Central Committee secretaries—Foreign Affairs Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, and Vitaliy Vorotnikov, RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman, and other personalities.

Leaves Moscow for Magnitogorsk

LD2806125189 East Berlin ADN International Service in German 1209 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow (ADN)—Erich Honecker, Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee general secretary and GDR State Council chairman, ended his working visit to Moscow this afternoon. He was warmly seen off at Vnukovo Airport by Aleksandr Yakovlev, Politburo member and CPSU Central Committee secretary.

Erich Honecker and his entourage flew on to Magnitogorsk where they are taking part in the festivities for the 60th anniversary of the founding of the city.

During his stay in Magnitogorsk, Erich Honecker is being accompanied by Vitaliy Vorotnikov, Politburo CPSU Central Committee member and RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium chairman.

SED Welcome for Gorbachev FRG Visit Noted

PM2306110189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 23 Jun 89 Second Edition p 7

[TASS report under the rubric "In Fraternal Parties": "Social Unity Party of Germany's Position"]

[Text] Berlin, 22 Jun—The Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee Politburo hails the results of M.S. Gorbachev's visit to the FRG as an important contribution to preserving and strengthening peace in Europe, J. Herrmann, member of the Politburo and secretary of the SED Central Committee, has declared. Addressing an SED Central Committee plenum which opened here today, he emphasized that the joint statement signed in Bonn attests to the application of the principles of peaceful coexistence in relations between states with different social systems. The GDR attaches special significance to the statements about respect for any state's territorial integrity and security, about the right freely to choose one's own social system, and about respect for the right to self-determination and for the norms of international law.

Dwelling on the question of relations with fraternal countries, J. Herrmann pointed out that the exchange of experience and opinions and these states' ties in various spheres are all-embracing and multifaceted.

Touching on GDR-FRG relations, the main speaker voiced concern at the revival of neo-Nazism in West Germany. If the GDR draws attention to this question, he said, it is only because of the danger that these phenomena pose to peace in Europe.

Analyst Views Bulgarian-Turkish Conflict

LD2706205689 Moscow TASS in English 1740 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—By TASS political news analyst Yuriy Kornilov: Several days ago the British DAILY TELEGRAPH newspaper, referring to unidentified sources, published an article which alleged that persons of the Turkish nationality are evicted from Bulgaria with the help of the Soviet Union.

TASS refuted then these allegations, stressing that the fabrications by the DAILY TELEGRAPH are either misrepresentation or deliberate misinformation. It would seem that everything is clear. But it turns out that the British newspaper quoted Turkish sources not in vain. Speaking at an Istanbul rally, Huesamettin Cindorouk, former general chairman of the True Path party, once again indulged in fables about the Soviet Union's involvement in the Turkish-Bulgarian conflict.

What can be said on this score? It is common knowledge that a certain number of Bulgarian citizens are currently leaving for Turkey. Commenting on this fact, official circles in Sofia explain in a serious and calm tone that all residents of Bulgaria have the right to freely leave the country and return to it and that any other interpretation of this fact is tendentious and incorrect.

Commentaries of another kind fill papers of several Turkish newspapers, which, without being fastidious in their choice of words, harp on the version about the "eviction" and "deportation" from Bulgaria of ethnic Turks, alleging that someone wants to deny them the language, religion, names, etc

So, a conflict situation is obvious, an element of tension in relations between the two neighbouring countries—Bulgaria and Turkey—has emerged and is gaining

momentum. Where is the way out? It seems that it should be looked for along the lines of a businesslike and constructive dialogue. What else except such a bilateral dialogue can help relieve tension?

But someone in Turkey, and not only there, would like, to all appearances, exploit the situation for other purposes. They assiduously try to muddy waters—find or, more accurately, fabricate some foreign reasons behind the conflict. Since there are no facts to support such allegations, outdated stereotypes about a "hand of Moscow", similar to the ones which were used at the Istanbul rally by Huesamettin Cindoruk, are put into play.

Why and for what purpose is this done. Certainly, not for the purpose of settling the situation. And, of course, not to facilitate a good development of Soviet-Turkish relations....

Hungarians on 'Anti-Sovietism' at Nagy Ceremony

Premier Grosz Cited

PM2206150189 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 22 Jun 89 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Interview With K. Grosz"]

[Text] Budapest, 21 Jun—Hungarian newspapers today published an interview with K. Grosz, general secretary of the Hungarian Socialist Workers Party [MSZMP]. In connection with the anti-Soviet demonstrations that took place in Budapest 16 June this year at the reburial of I. Nagy and his supporters, he said that during the ceremony some of the demonstrators had exploited this humanitarian act for political propaganda, without showing a sufficient sense of responsibility for the deceased or respect for state interests.

Touching on the agenda of the forthcoming MSZMP Central Committee plenum, he reported that it will decide on the timetable and procedure for convening the next party congress. Bearing in mind the domestic political situation, the plenum will discuss topical domestic policy issues, the position in the party, and its tasks in precongress work.

The congress agenda will include three points: the examination of the draft new MSZMP statutes, the election of leading organs under the new system, and the adoption of the party's policy statement. If the Central Committee approves, the chairman and general secretary of the MSZMP will be elected and the decision made on the candidate to be recommended by the party for the post of president of the republic by a partywide ballot.

The interview points out that secretaryships in the MSZMP Central Committee and the party chairmanship are currently vacant. Corresponding proposals on candidates for these posts will be presented by the Nominations Commission under J. Fock.

Veterans Make Statement

PM2206104389 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 22 Jun 89 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Statement Published"]

[Text] Budapest, 21 Jun—The Presidium of the Union of Hungarian Resistance Fighters and Antifascists published a statement here today. It points out that two speakers who spoke at the 16 June ceremony to reinter the remains of I. Nagy and his supporters did not abide by the spirit of reconciliation and national public concord. By their speeches they deeply insulted political faith in the said figures, defiled the mourning ceremony, and used it to arouse anti-Soviet and anticommunist passions and to fan cheap political sentiments.

Our political, historical, and combat experience, the statement emphasizes, attests that anti-Sovietism and anticommunism have always been a means of right-wing extremist demagoguery. It is immaterial whether they occurred decades ago or are manifested today.

We deem it necessary to protest any kind of manifestations of anti-Soviet and anticommunist incitement and to express the conviction that what is needed in the present situation is the kind of reconciliation and national concord whose spirit was correctly reflected by the other speakers at the mourning ceremony, who paid a fitting tribute of respect for the memory of the deceased persons, the document points out.

Solovyev Attends Leningrad-Dresden Days Ceremony

PM2206153089 Leningrad LENINGRADSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 13 Jun 89 p 1

[TASS report: "Friendship Festival Begins"]

[Excerpt] The symbol of Leningrad—the little gold ship on the Admiralty spire—and Dresden's coat of arms are depicted on the emblem for the festival of this twin city that has begun in our city. This time the traditional international festival is devoted to the 40th anniversary of the formation of the GDR. The ceremonial opening took place at the Tauride Palace yesterday.

Many representatives of the public, working people from Dresden and its Bezirk who have come here on the friendship train, artists, and envoys from friendship societies, trade unions, and youth organizations gathered in the white-columned Oval Hall, which was decked with the GDR and USSR state flags.

The anthem to the great city rang out. Welcoming the guests, Yu.F. Solovyev, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of Leningrad Oblast Party Committee [obkom], said that the friendship between the two cities is not simply a good tradition. It is an organic part of the living tissue of lasting alliance between the peoples of the Soviet Union and the GDR. This indissoluble, time-tested alliance is

based on the unity of the historical choice in favor of the priorities of socialism and democracy and the struggle for disarmament and the new political thinking. Mutual interest and the intensive exchange of experience and ideas create a favorable environment for the further deepening of cooperation and for giving new content to the broad relations of partnership. These relations are based on the accords reached during meetings between M.S. Gorbachev and Erich Honecker.

In the contacts between Leningrad and Dresden, Yu.F. Solovyev went on to note, new shoots are gradually gaining strength. Direct links have already been established between more than 40 enterprises and organizations in the two cities. Last year a cooperation program was signed by Leningrad Oblast Soviet Executive Committee and Dresden Bezirk Council. The common task is to consolidate achievements and improve the devleopment of economic, scientific, technical, and cultural ties. May the Dresden Days help to strengthen fraternal collaboration between the two regions and the peoples of our countries.

A reply speech was delivered by the leader of the Dresden Bezirk delegation, Hans Modrow, member of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany [SED] Central Committee and first secretary of the Bezirk party committee.

"The relations that have been developing in various forms for many years between Dresden and Leningrad have confirmed their vitality and mutual benefit for the GDR and the USSR. Traditional festivals in honor of the twinned cities have always been the acme of our friendship. The present celebrations are taking place under the banner of the republic's 40th anniversary. For us these years have been linked indissolubly with fraternal friendship and all-around cooperation with the Soviet land. We are fully determined to strengthen them on the basis of new demands and conditions. This desire is also characteristic of the program for the Dresden Days. They enable us to exchange experience in the implementation of the decisions of the 11th SED Congress and the 27th CPSU Congress. I am sure that the meetings in Leningrad will help to deepen relations of friendship and strengthen socialism."

A.N. Gerasimov, N.I. Popov, A.S. Tumanov, and V.Ya. Khodyrev, members of Leningrad CPSU Obkom Bureau, and V.A. Lopatnikov, representative of the USSR Foreign Ministry in Leningrad, took part in the opening of the twin city's festival. [passage omitted]

West Europe

Soviet Ship Ignores Sweden's Request To Leave

LD2306103189 Stockholm Domestic Service in Swedish 0930 GMT 23 Jun 89

[Text] Since yesterday a Soviet research vessel has been in the Swedish fishing zone off the southern shoals of Oeland Island without permission. Despite requests from the Swedish Coast Guard to leave the area, the ship is still there. The Foreign Ministry has also requested by radio that the vessel depart. The ship, called the "Strelets", of 2,500 dead weight tonnes, is said to be conducting some form of underwater activity.

Aerial surveillance by the Coast Guard has shown that the vessel has deployed a cable or wire. The captain has declined to explain what is going on, however.

The Coast Guard will send another surveillance aircraft to the area today.

USSR To Mediate Between Bulgaria, Turkey

TA2706142089 Ankara Domestic Service in Turkish 1400 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] The Soviet Union will mediate between Turkey and Bulgaria on the issue of the oppression of Turks in Bulgaria. Foreign Minister Mesut Yilmaz met today with Albert Sergeyevich Chernyshev, Soviet ambassador to Ankara, for 2 and ½ hours .

In a statement to journalists following the meeting, Chernyshev said that a process of mediation has been initiated between the Turkish and Bulgarian governments. He added that the mission of mediation to be conducted by himself has been approved by the Turkish and Bulgarian governments.

He explained that this diplomatic process is only in its initial stages and that he cannot give any more details on the subject. He added that he will continue his contacts in Ankara, Sofia, and Moscow.

USSR Reportedly Sends Troops to Bulgaria

NC2306153489 Istanbul TERCUMAN in Turkish 21 Jun 89 p 8

[Excerpt] Edirne (TERCUMAN)—Bulgaria, which has forced our kinsmen to immigrate, has taken military measures to deal with "internal unrest." It has been reported that while military units have been instructed to settle in the villages evacuated by our kinsmen in Bulgaria, the Soviet Union has sent a division of troops and armored units to that country as a precaution against a possible "major internal clash."

According to information a TERCUMAN correspondent received from our kinsmen who crossed the Bulgarian border into Turkey and from Turkish Transit Highway International truck drivers, the Bulgarian Government has started to take measures to eliminate the gap created by the Turkish immigrants, who already number over 50,000. It has been reported that the Bulgarian officials are being forces to take measures because of agitation among the Bulgarians themselves.

According to our kinsmen from Bulgaria, the Soviet Union sent a division of troops to Bulgaria through Varna at the request of the Bulgarian Government last

week. A special effort was made by the Soviet Union to ensure that the troops sent to Bulgaria in Bulgarian military uniform were not of Turkish origin. The Soviet move has been described as a measure against "significant uprising" in that country and not as a precaution against Turkey.

Turkey has not yet received reliable information on the exact number of Soviet trops in Bulgaria, which have been reinforced with armored units.

Meanwhile, Bulgarian military units are reported to have been settled in the villages evacuated by the Bulgarian Turks in order to maintain agricultural work. The Bulgarian trops are reported to feel uneasy about having to work in tobacco fields and graze livestock. On the other hand, the Bulgarian people are reported to be displeased with the forced immigration of the Bulgarian Turks. [passage omitted]

Embassy Official in Turkey on Defection, Bulgaria
NC2606104289 Istanbul GUNAYDIN in Turkish 21 Jun 89 p 9

[Interview with with Valter Shonia, undersecretary at the USSR Embassy, by unidentified GUNAYDIN correspondent in Ankara; date of interview not given]

[Text] [Correspondent] Is there a problem between Turkey and the Soviet Union? If so, is it because Aleksandr Zuyev, the pilot of the MiG-29 that was commandeered to Turkey, has gone to the United States?

[Shonia] All national issues must be regarded separately in the Soviet Union. We are against any kind of terrorism, regardless of whether it is carried out by people in uniform or civilians. We attach importance to close international cooperation on this matter.

Our stand on the case of Aleksandr Zuyev is entirely justified. We do not regard this as something in which we are not involved. We regret that Zuyev was able to travel to the United States without being punished. We have not been able to agree on a common understanding against terrorism, and so Zuyev could go to a third country without being penalized. Actually, we did not expect such a decision from Turkey, a country with which we have raised relations to their present level.

[Correspondent] Will this regret have a bearing on future relations between Turkey and the USSR?

[Shonia] We, as the USSR Embassy, hope that the negative effect does not continue for long. But the embassy is the embassy. There is also the Soviet public, whose opinion has had a great deal of influence recently.

[Correspondent] How does the Soviet public view the matter?

[Shonia] The Soviet public feels hurt, particularly the military, because the criminal was a soldier. What he did is regarded as a kind of treason against the homeland. I am telling you this very sincerely.

[Correspondent] How does the Soviet Union regard the question of forced emigration from Bulgaria? How does it regard the matter from the point of view of human rights? It is believed that a move by the Soviet Union may change Bulgaria's approach...

[Shonia] You must ask Bulgaria all this and not us. But if you insist that I reply to your question, then let me tell you that our stand on the matter is well known. Why are we questioned in this regard at present? Why? What is the object behind the questioning? This must also be considered. Are we expected to reply when tension exists? We are convinced that problems cannot be resolved through propaganda campaigns in any part of the world.

Our view on the matter is quite clear. If there are problems between the two sides, then we support the settlement of those problems through dialogue.

[Correspondent] You are saying that Bulgaria and Turkey should resolve their problems through negotiations, and that the Soviet Union does not wish to involve itself in the matter.

[Shonia] Yes, that is correct. What does it mean when it is said during the rallies in the squares that "the Soviet Union should resolve the problem?" What are they looking for in our stand? Do they not know that Bulgaria is an ally of the Soviet Union? Do they not know that we are treating Turkey in a very friendly way? Why do they wish to push us into a corner? I have been unable to understand this. Bulgaria is an independent country. It has its own policies and views. We are not in a position to criticize Bulgaria. No country is in a position to do that. A dialogue must be established.

[Correspondent] You don't have to comment if you don't want to, but Turkey has been calling on Bulgaria to agree to negotiations. There has been no official reply from Bulgaria thus far.

[Shonia] I believe, and correct me if I'm wrong, that the two sides signed a protocol in Belgrade in which they agreed to resolve between themselves any problems that might arise. Both sides agreed to this. The protocol was signed by both countries, not just one of them. Is that not so?

[Correspondent] As far as we know...

[Shonia] Yes, as far as you know. You know this.

[Correspodnent] I am asking what you know.

[Shonia] As far as I know, the Bulgarian side has not tried to avoid this procedure at all. It has yet to do so. As a third country, we sincerely hoped that such a problem would not emerge.

[Correspondent] You said that the two sides signed the protocol. However, one of the sides began implementing a policy of forced emigration.

[Shonia] As far as we know, a policy of forced emigration does not exist.

[Correspondent] I don't understand. Did you say that forced emigration does not exist?

[Shonia] Forced emigration is out of the question. That is what we know.

[Correspondent] Do you mean that the emigration is voluntary?

[Shonia] That is how it seems to me. There was an insistence on the question of emigration in the past. As you know, passport regulations were changed in Bulgaria later on. Anyone is free to travel to Bulgaria. As far as we know, this is the situation.

[Correspondent] Do you mean to say that our kinsmen who have arrived in Turkey can return to Bulgaria if they wish?

[Shonia] I do not know the details of passport regulations in Bulgaria. That is what our Bulgarian colleagues here in Ankara have said. They keep the doors of their country open.

[Correspondent] You have said that according to the passport regulations anyone can travel to Bulgaria. However, neither I nor any other journalist from a European country can travel to Bulgaria.

[Shonia] I am referring to Bulgarian citizens. Their doors are open to their own citizens.

Border Protocol Initialed With Turkey

TA2306191889 Ankara ANATOLIA in English 1730 GMT 23 Jun 89

[Text] Ankara (A.A)—A protocol on joint control of the Turco-Soviet border was initialed today at the conclusion of joint committee meetings between Turkey and the Soviet Union.

The final protocol, including the results of a series of joint inspections of rivers and streams which cross the border line, which took place during the period between 1984 and 1988, will be signed at a future meeting of the joint committee in Moscow.

The joint control committee monitored river-course changes in the Aras and Coruh Rivers and the Arpacay, Posof and Caksu streams which cross the line of the border.

Gen Varennikov Cited on German Reunification

LD2806165289 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1607 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] The head of the Soviet army has told former Ulster MP [Member of Parliament] Enoch Powell that his country would not oppose the reunification of Germany.

"Reunification...is a matter for the German people," said General Valentin Verennikov, the commander in chief of Soviet land forces.

"I personally consider that no other state is entitled to interfere in the solution of this problem, " He told Mr Powell in an interview to be broadcast on BBC TV next week.

General Verennikov went on: "how they decide their fate, the fate of the Germans and the future of their states as they develop—that is their business.

"West and East Germany are sovereign states. Of course at one time there was a single Germany, but now they are completely different states with different systems."

Mr Powell, a former conservative cabinet minister who later became official unionist MP for the Northern Ireland constituency of South Down, said after the interview that the statement was remarkable and must have come from President Gorbachev.

"It must be official and of course you have to personalise it by saying Gorbachev," he said.

"The fact that so high-ranking an officer in an official position quite deliberately said it was nobody's business to interfere in the reunification of Germany couldn't be an accident.

"I am sure he was saying nothing which would cause any embarrassment at home. He is not a man out of whom sentences slip"

The general who commanded the Soviet withdrawal from Afghanistan, made his comments in his first interview with the west, which will be screened in the BBC 1 Byline series on Monday. [scheduled for 2030 GMT 3 July]

Shevardnadze Receives Outgoing Envoys

FRG Ambassador

LD2706211589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1953 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jun (TASS)—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR Foreign Minister, today received Andreas Meyer-Landrut, FRG ambassador to the USSR, in connection with the end of his period of service and forthcoming departure for home.

The ambassador handed Shevardnadze a letter from FRG Foreign Minister Hans-Dietrich Genscher.

During the conversation, which took place in a friendly atmosphere, confirmation was given to the sides' intention to consistently and vigorously implement the important agreements and accords that were reached in the course of Mikhail Gorbachev's recent official visit to the FRG. Of particular importance to the development of relations of genuine good-neighborliness and fair partnership between the USSR and the FRG is the joint statement signed in Bonn by the leaders of both states.

Shevardnadze expressed to Meyer-Landrut his gratitude for his useful work as the FRG's ambassador to the USSR and wished him success in his new and responsible position.

Cyprus Ambassador

LD2706220589 Moscow TASS in English 2048 GMT 27 jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—Eduard Shevardnadze, member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Politburo and USSR minister of foreign affairs, received on Tuesday [26 June] ambassador of the Republic of Cyprus Michael Sherifis in connection with his departure from the Soviet Union upon the conclusion of his tour of duty.

During the conversation, the Soviet side emphasized the striving for the further development and deepening of friendly relations with the Republic of Cuba [as received], for the widening of interaction of the two countries in international problems of mutual interest. The Soviet Union's principled support for the Good Offices Mission of the United Nations secretary general to Cyprus, as well as for the dialogue between the Cyprus communities was confirmed. The Soviet foreign minister wished success to the forthcoming meeting in New York of leaders of the two Cyprus communities in the interest of achieving durable and fair solution to the Cyprus problem.

Sherifs expressed gratitude for the Soviet Union's invariable interest and solidarity with the just struggle of the Cyprus people.

Political & Social

27 Jun Meeting of USSR Supreme Soviet Reported

Opening Session

LD2706234189

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1400 GMT on 27 June broadcasts a 2-hour recording of the 27 June Supreme Soviet session. Gorbachev opens the session by giving deputies an account of yesterday's decisions by the chambers and says that it is possible to move on to considering the first issue of the agenda—the formation of the USSR Council of Ministers—and then gives the floor to Ryzhkov. Ryzhkov delivers a report. Gorbachev then invites questions for Ryzhkov. A stream of deputies, beginning with Tarazevich, then ask various questions about ecology, the composition of the ministries, patronage and other assistance for rural areas, individual candidacies, health, care for veterans, facilities for ethnic peoples, harvest payments, and the closure of nuclear test sites. Questions are addressed both to Ryzhkov and Gorbachev, who occasionally interjects either in reply or remarks on procedural points. Among these exchanges are:

"[Komarov] Deputy Komarov. Nikolay Ivanovich, I repeat my question about the destiny of the USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry. The thing is that when you answered me the first time, you spoke of several bodies, 10 to be exact. Well, when we confirm Comrade Syrov or rather considered his candidacy for the post of chairman of the State Construction Committee, a single body, that is preserving the ministry in its current form, under the guise of a single body, was already being talked about. Now you have again spoken about several bodies. Clarify this please.

"[Ryzhkov] In working out this matter, there were many views and proposals about how to organize the structure of the administrative bodies—in this case we are talking of bodies—and whether this will be a state body, or an association, etc. Such outlines and proposals do exist. There is the view that there should be a single state body. In my view, this is wrong. Surely we don't need to set up an enormous, unmanageable body. I think that this has to be done democratically. We must bring the directors together and, as they say, resolve the matters of setting up the body. I think that there should be several of them, several of them.

"[Komarov] That's clear."

Deputy Platonov shouts a question from the hall asking for Ryzhkov's view on Comrade Abalkin's proposal that if there are no changes in the country after 2 or 3 years, the government should resign.

"[Ryzhkov] Personally, I think that first one must confirm the government. [laughter, applause in the hall] If one speaks about the resignation of the government...[changes thought] Well, this theme was heard at the Congress of People's Deputies. I want to say that I do not rule it out that in the future laws may be adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet, about a vote of no-confidence in the government.

"[Gorbachev] About a vote of confidence....

"[Ryzhkov, interrupting] ...about a vote of confidence in the government. But at the same time, I personally think that if such a law is adopted on, as they say, a vote of confidence in the government, it should at the same time be registered that the government has the right, taking into account whatever situation has arisen, to retire. That is my view—both a vote of confidence, and at the same time the right of the government, if it seems that is incapable of fulfilling the functions placed upon it for one reason or another, to retire."

Gorbachev then invites Deputy (Byshev) to speak.

"[(Byshev)] Right, Deputy (Byshev). I have a question which is partly for you and which partly concerns our commissions. When I became acquainted with the resolution of the commissions, I was puzzled by the resolution concerning two deputies, two members of the government, first concerning Comrade Gusev and also, in part, concerning Comrade Bykov. According to the resolution, less than half of the people's deputies who took part in the discussion voted for Comrade Gusev. At the same time, he...[changes thought] The commission made the decision to recommend him. That is completely incomprehensible to me. In accordance with the decision on standing commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet, which is in effect and which has also been distributed to the committees, more than half of the deputiess' votes of the whole complement of commissions is required. Yet here less than half of those who took part in the voting actually voted. So how is it that in this case these deputies, these members...deputies, these candidate members of the government can be regarded as having been recommended?

"[Ryzhkov] I think that the first question—about Gusev—is not a question for me. I was told that Comrade Gusev had been recommended by this commission. And as to what the voting there was—for, against, and abstaining—well, you understand that is not a question for me. It is evidently a question for this commission, so I cannot reply to it. I think that the chairman of that commission who conducted it should reply.

"As far as Comrade Bykov is concerned, well, I have said in my report that yes, Comrade Bykov was discussed in three commissions, three. Two commissions gave him a positive appraisal, that is, recommended him for this post. And one commission, the Ecological Commission, did not recommend him and voted against him.

"However, taking into account that, as far as I am informed, the comrades, when speaking against Comrade Bykov, said that generally, in principle, they were not speaking against Bykov personally, and that he is an educated, competent and organized and energetic person.... They were speaking against the BVK [Protein Vitamin Concentrate] program. The protein concentrate...that is, protein, animal...that is....

"[Gorbachev] Protein vitamin concentrate.

"[Ryzhkov] Yes. Protein from hydrocarbon raw material. I have now presented the relevant program here, because what is at issue is not Bykov. The thing is that recently we have really confronted this problem. Plants are closing down, as they say. We can't engage new plants. Mass meetings are taking place. People are against BVK and so on. And so you have seen that a program has been presented to slow down now, and not to build or extend enterprises. And so far as those capacities which have been set up and which are producing millions of tonnes are concerned—well, they have to be reprofiled, as they say, during the 13th 5-Year Plan.

"So, I appealed to the Supreme Soviet from these positions, taking these positions into account, to return once again...[changes thought] both to the renaming of this ministry and, as they say, to further consider the possibility of confirming Comrade Bykov for this ministry.

"[Gorbachev] Nikolay Ivanovich. As far as Comrade Gusev is concerned, may it be understood that you maintain your initial proposal to recommend him for the post of deputy [chairman]?

"[Ryzhkov] Yes. Yes, without a doubt.

"[Gorbachev] Comrade Yablokov....

"[Ryzhkov, interrupting] As far as Gusev is concerned, I have a quite firm view, and I considered that he had gone through the commissions. I am convinced that this is a person capable of solving matters."

A deputy asked about the future of the Soviet Union's nuclear testing grounds in light of the new military doctrine and the new world situation. Ryzhkov replied as follows:

"I think—and this is the view of our country's entire political leadership—that we would be happy to close down our country's nuclear testing grounds even today. You know that for a period of 1 and ½ years our testing grounds were silent. But then we were, nevertheless, obliged to begin, or rather continue, testing, though as far as Semipalatinsk is concerned it has now been decided to dramatically limit the number of tests in that ground...and the yield is being reduced correspondingly.

"As for the future, i think that as soon as there evolves an international situation which permits us not to improve anything in the area of nuclear weapons, the testing grounds should be closed down first and foremost."

Second Session

LD2706230289

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1600 GMT on 27 June carries a 1 hour 45-minute recorded relay of the second session of today's joint sitting of the two chambers of the USSR Supreme Soviet at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow.

Gorbachev begins by inviting Deputy Peters to speak. Peters questioned Ryzhkov's support for the continued existence of the USSR Ministry of Culture alongside the equivalent republican ministries, wondering whether this would not mean encouraging monoculturalism. Ryzhkov replies that any implantation of monoculturalism by the USSR Ministry of Culture is impermissible; it must serve the purpose of mutual cultural enrichment.

Deputy Nikolayev asks Ryzhkov how the union social budget is formed. Ryzhkov says the methods used are now being changed. In the past, the government determined how the state budget should be apportioned, and the Supreme Soviet gave its approval; in the future, the government will make proposals and the Supreme Soviet will analyze and finalize them. With the onset of regional financial autonomy the old methods will become unsuitable. Deputy Yezhelev from Leningrad asks whether there is any guarantee that the proposed new amalgamated ministries will operate better than their precedessors, and whether there is any plan for a functional transformation of the country' government. Ryzhkov replies that he dealt with this in his report. As enterprises become more independent and wholesale markets are developed, the number of industrial ministries will fall. The functions of existing ministries must also be reviewed. Gorbachev asked whether the question and answer session has gone on long enough: a show of hands shows that the majority agrees. Ryzhkov then quickly deals with a few written questions, including one on law and order. He says "very serious measures" must be taken to counter crime; a "special program" must be drawn up.

Gorbachev hands over to Deputy Shtoyk for the first of the speeches.

Shtoyk criticizes the proposed amalgamation of the Ministries of Ferrous and Non-Ferrous Metallurgy as a move that could inflict "irreparable damage" on the production and supply of certain metals. Given the differences in the way the two industries operate, amalgamation will not improve standards. This matter must be reviewed before the autumn session of the congress. Shtoyk concludes by proposing that enterprises give some of their profits to local soviets.

Deputy Denisov begins by regretting that in the restructuring of Soviet life, the three subsystems of material production, political power, and ideology are becoming confused. Political figures are far too involved in production affairs instead of performing their own functions, such as working out a restructuring concept. Gosplan should be planning the future of restructuring instead of the "idiocy of 5-year planning from what has been achieved"; this is a "brake" on restructuring. Gosplan should belong to the legislative rather than executive branch. The legislative and executive functions of other state committees must be separated. To ensure success the production sphere must be detached from the state sphere, as in the West. The way to do this, Denisov suggests, is by setting up "special zones, in which restructuring is carried out straight away, once and for all." The number of zones will then gradually grow to cover the whole country. Denisov ends by congratulating Gorbachev on his visit to the FRG: It means that "we are, it seems, moving away from confrontation toward a state of partnership, in a certain sense, with a central NATO power."

Deputy Gudaytis is next to speak. He recalls Deputy Peters' question on the USSR Ministry of Culture, maintaining that culture is purely a republican matter. Similarly, there is no need for a central education body. "Quite wrongly, the union government, which is hardly likely to cope with its duties—please forgive me for this personal view of mine—and will soon resign—I believe this will happen—is taking excessive responsibilities upon itself in the spheres of culture and education," he says. The money spent on the USSR Ministry of Culture and Committee for National Education would be better used to finance children's homes.

Deputy Motornyy then speaks of the "extremely severe" situation in the agrarian sector. Despite all the talk about taking measures, there is "very little" practical result. Many of the decisions of agriculture have done nothing but damage. The Council of Ministers was "very hasty" in abolishing the Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources: However badly it functioned, it provided services which farms themselves cannot afford. Motornyy emphasized that Comrade Polad-Zade is the best candidate for the job of minister of water industry construction.

Deputy Nikolaychuk then takes the floor to say that the commissions and committees have not had time to study the government's proposals closely. In the proposed law on the USSR Council of Ministers "state power remains virtually entirely in the hands of the government, which is the sole possessor and manager of all financial, material and natural resources." Expenditure for the upkeep of the USSR Council of Ministers should be subject to Supreme Soviet approval.

To prevent non-ferrous metallurgy enterprises being swallowed up in the proposed new amalgamated ministry, Deputy Blayev proposes setting up a USSR Metallurgy Committee, to which the two existing ministries would be subordinate. Other suggestions regarding industrial matters follow.

Deputy Drunina speaks about the importance of culture and standards of behavior, defending the existence of the USSR Ministry of Culture.

Deputy Venrev takes the discussion back to agriculture, praising the merits of natural protein and rape crops for feed. Republics with a labor surplus should sign contracts with labor-defficient areas such as Siberia.

Gorbachev reminds deputies to stick to the points on the session's agenda.

Deputy Komarov then defends the record of the USSR Ministry of the Construction Materials Industry, detailing some of its activities. The ministry must not be abolished, he concludes.

Deputy Safiyeva takes the floor and complains about working conditions in Tajikistan's cotton fields. Workers there are not being paid a climatic condition coefficient—"a direct human rights violation by the state." Overuse of chemicals is creating ecological danger. An expert study should be made of ecological conditions throughout the USSR, starting with Tajikistan. The Rogulskiy hydroelectric power station is doing more damage than good.

Deputy Bocharov is the next speaker. The proposed law on the USSR Council of Minister fails to answer many questions. In particular, there is no reduction of the "overcentralization" of the existing apparatus. There is too much vagueness in the talk of altering the ministries' functions. Bocharov explained why Polad-Zade's nomination was rejected: As first deputy minister of land reclamation he made too many mistakes. He also outlined the failings of Gribov, another ministerial nominee.

Deputy Atadzhanov speaks against the merging of the oil and gas ministries. Instead, refineries and petrochemical works should be attached to the Ministry of the Petroleum Industry in its present form. Similar changes could be made in the gas industry. As a candidate for chairman of Gosplan, Comrade Maslyukov is perfectly suited. Despite the "old stereotyped values" in the work of the Bureau for Social Development, headed by Comrade Biryukova, she should be confirmed in that post.

The recorded relay ends at 1745 GMT.

Evening Session

LD2806005389

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1745 GMT on 27 June broadcasts a 2-hour "delayed relay" of the evening session of the Supreme Soviet at the Kremlin Palace of Congresses on 27 June chaired by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Mikhail Gorbachev.

The relay begins with Deputy Burlatskiy speaking. Burlatskiy describes the questions his commission put to Kamenstev and Katushev about foreign trade performance, in particular on reversing the reduction in purchases of consumer goods from abroad. Burlatskiy expresses his commission's support for Shevardnadze as foreign minister and the hope that the Foreign Ministry's actions will be reflected domestically, particularly in implementing human rights agreements in Soviet laws. Burlatskiy proposes the creation of a cabinet of the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet to coordinate political actions.

Deputy Melikov, a composer, defends the idea of having a Culture Ministry.

Deputy Borodin calls for the production of medical equipment to be concentrated in one ministry and for protein concentrate production to be handed over to the chemical industry.

Deputy Stadnik says that the Supreme Soviet should not be making requests to ministers but should be the legislative body it was originally supposed to be. All proposals should be registered.

Gorbachev replies that this is being done, largely via commissions. Gorbachev then addresses the Supreme Soviet.

Gorbachev replies briefly to a question from Deputy Primakov about amalgamated ministries' functions.

Deputy Khadzhiyev proposes a move away from management by ministry to management by large industrial associations as happened during the years of the New Economic Policy. The deputy also makes proposals about the names of ministries and commissions. He goes on to say that republics should be held financially responsible for the excesses of their citizens as in Fergana and Novyy Uzen and pay damages to the victims.

Gorbachev recalls that there has been heated discussion about the need for an all-union ministry of construction materials and asks Ryzhkov his opinion on the subject. Ryzhkov says that he wishes to reduce the number of ministries but one more would not matter very much. Gorbachev says that some republics favor a central ministry.

Deputy Ivasho says that the preservation of a central building materials industry is contrary to the principles of restructuring and increasing local autonomy. Gorbachev puts the issue to a vote. The number of votes is not stated. Gorbachev says: "That means we have returned to the position as set out."

Gorbachev recalls that opposition had been expressed to having a committee on national education. Deputy Roy Medvedev suggests that the committee should also embrace culture as there is no need for a culture ministry which had proved of little worth in the past.

Deputy Andreyeva makes an emotional plea for the retention of the culture ministry.

Gorbachev puts the question of the existence of the USSR Culture Ministry to a vote. Deputies vote in favor of the ministry. There are 59 votes against and 10 abstentions. A total of 491 deputies are present at the session.

Gorbachev puts the question of the existence of the USSR education committee to a vote. Deputies vote in favor of the committee. There are 63 against and 1 abstention.

Deputy Sazonov says that Gorbachev's proposal to adopt the law on the Council of Ministers in the autumn is too hasty. New economic relations must be established first. Gorbachev rebuts these arguments. Ryzhkov expresses agreement with the essence of Sazonov's ideas. The session agrees not to specify any timeframe for adopting the law.

An unidentified deputy calls for the medical industry not to be linked to the biochemical industry in the same ministry. Ryzhkov says that he carried out extensive consultations on this matter and gives the reasons for the linkage. Gorbachev invites Academician Chazov to express his opinion. Chazov says that 25-30 percent of medicines are based on biotechnology. The medical industry needs to update its technology which is about 30 years out of date.

Deputy Shapovalenko tells of the vast pollution caused by the microbiological industry. He calls for a total ban on production of protein vitamin concentrates.

Ryzhkov replies. A program adopted in 1986 envisioned the production of 2 million tonnes of protein per year from hydrocarbon raw materials by 1990. Production to date is 1 million tonnes. The program is to be halted at this figure. Existing protein vitamin concentrates capacities are to be converted to ecologically pure products during the 13th 5-year plan.

Deputy Rakhimov expresses opposition to the production of protein vitamin concentrates.

Deputy Vorontsov gives his opinion on the name of the medical ministry and its functions.

Deputy Borodin offers a suggestion on the name of the ministry.

An unidentified deputy complains that there is no committee to oversee living standards.

Deputy (Chug) stresses the need for regional economic changes to be linked with changes to ministries.

An unidentified deputy calls for the creation of a state committee for land use.

In reply, Ryzhkov says the Committee for Labor and Social Questions will answer for social issues. "The question has been raised very acutely about unemployment in several regions of our country. In this case it is in the republics of Central Asia and the Trans-Caucasus. The question must be tackled. Indeed, this problem does exist in our country. We have often closed our eyes to this matter saying that there is no such problem. In fact, it does exist and today it is creating such flareups which we have seen in, say, Uzbekistan. Second, like it or not, economic reform will operate in such a way that people will gradually be released from their jobs. We must adopt a correct course and elaborate a correct policy on how to act so as to prevent unemployment in our country. This issue must be taken up by the Committee for Labor along with other economic departments." The committee will also tackle many other social issues.

Ryzhkov says that republics should assume responsibility for agriculture: "We believe that 75 percent of the problems in the country with regard to social tension would disappear today if agricultural issues were solved, if we provided a good supply of food products to the population. So, surely the government cannot stand aside in this urgent matter. That is laughable. So, we then looked at what should be done. If we transfer agricultural production to the republics, what must be left at the top?" We decided to create within the government, directly in the presidium, to create a state commission on agricultural procurements. This commission should be headed by a first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers." This reflects the importance with which it is regarded. It will also have various nationwide functions. It is not a committee on land use which is required, but laws on land use.

Gorbachev then puts to a vote the law on the Council of Ministers with the proposed amendments. Voting is by chambers, with not all figures given. In the Soviet of the Union three abstained. In the Soviet of Nationalities there are 10 against and 7 abstentions. Both chambers approve the law.

Gorbachev proposes a 20-minute break. There are sounds of disapproval from the hall. It is proposed to close at 1800. Gorbachev then invites Lukyanov to speak.

The recorded relay ends at 1947 GMT.

Ryzhkov's 27 Jun Report to Supreme Soviet
PM2806113389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

["Report by N.I. Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers" delivered at the 27 June joint session of the Soviet of the Union and the Soviet of Nationalities at the Palace of Congresses in the Kremlin]

[Text] Esteemed members of the USSR Supreme Soviet! The 2 weeks that have elapsed since the conclusion of the work of the Congress of People's Deputies have made it possible to comprehend even more deeply its Enormous importance for the whole of society and to understand the new factors that it has introduced into the development of our political system. One can say without exaggeration that the congress has become a unique manifestation in the life of the state.

No less important is the fact that it has formed a permanently functioning parliament of the country which is active, truly capable, and in its essence aimed at ensuring the interests of the people. A most major step has been taken in the development of democracy. We are convinced of this in the best possible way by the work of the commissions of the chambers of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR, and of its committees. Assessing everything that has been done over a short period of time, during which they have examined the structure for the management of the national economy put forward by the government and discussed the personnel composition of the USSR Council of Ministers, one can say in figurative terms that the atmosphere that has been brought about by the congress has been vigorously maintained by the people's deputies throughout all those days.

What conclusions can one draw from the numerous speeches and exchanges of opinions with people's deputies at the sittings of the commissions and committees? Before setting them out, I would like to stress that everything that has taken place during the discussion of the proposals that we put forward is already characteristic of the businesslike relations that will come into being between the government and the USSR Supreme Soviet, its commissions, and committees. In the first place, we have bidden farewell to the "realm of sleep" at sittings of that kind. That has become something of the past, and I am sure that it will remain so forever. A businesslike attitude, an approach that is neither formal nor indifferent, a sincere interest, an openness of opinions, and exactingness: those are the most characteristic features that have been shown in the work, and which I would place at the top of the assessment that can be given today. In the second place, a direct challenge has been

issued to the practice of forming the government of the USSR and making structural changes in the management of the national economy in the way that is cut off from life, to an approach towards the discussion of personnel being appointed to leading state posts that has not changed for decades.

This is unusual, uncustomary—and yet it bears witness to the fact that the revolutionary nature of our parliament is in harmony with the mighty idea of restructuring.

Third, and perhaps most importantly, proposals such as these have never yet been subject to such scrupulous, all-around and, I would say, incisive examination in the USSR Supreme Soviet. This is without doubt a very positive and encouraging fact. For in essence, the government's principles and approaches towards implementing a structural restructuring of the management of economy have passed the real test of soundness. And this test was a pretty tough one. I can only thank the deputies for their exacting and principled approach.

Now I shall move on to the main subject, namely what we have gained, and what steps we are compelled to take in the future, in light of the substantive part of the discussion on the government's proposal at sessions of the commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet. The fact is that the people's deputies voiced many useful and constructive proposals. It would be wholly impermissible to take no account of these in drawing up the program for the government's activity and in organizing further work. To summarize the most important thing that we must take from this very specific and extremely valuable discussion, the essence of all that was voiced by the people's deputies can be boiled down to the following: First, it is a package of proposals for stepping up even more intensively than planned the social orientation of the work of all organs of state administration, and above all with regard to speeding up the solution of the urgent tasks facing us. These proposals include suggestions which make it possible to fully evaluate the correctness of the priorities in the development of the national economy. These relate to satiating the market with consumer goods and housing construction, the development of the material base of the social and cultural sphere, and the creation of conditions for the spiritual growth of the individual.

People's deputies in virtually all the commissions and committees devoted special attention to the problems of the countryside. Given the deteriorating situation with regard to supplying the population with food, the newly-formed government, in conjunction with the USSR Supreme Soviet, is to implement, in accordance with the congress decision, a package of urgent measures that will make it realistically possible to heal the breach in this major branch.

Second, this [the deputies' remarks] constitutes important additions to the program adopted by the government for financial improvement in the country's economy. These make it possible, with the Supreme Soviet and its commissions and committees, to go deeper into this matter and to adopt the appropriate decisions.

Furthermore, this constitutes a series of specific comments which make it possible to give a fresh evaluation of and to make use of the opportunities for accelerating and deepening radical economic reform. And finally, they gave a fundamentally new approach toward implementing cadre policy in the top level of administration.

Bearing in mind that the USSR Supreme Soviet will have to make decisions on proposals, approved by commissions and committees, regarding the structure of managing the national economy, that is precisely what I shall begin with.

I must say that there were no significant observations with regard to the structure of state administration bodies. Admittedly, individual deputies had formed several points of view concerning the expediency of splitting up or merging some ministries and departments. But in general, proposals of this kind did not receive due support from the deputies and consequently we need not talk about each of these in detail. At the same time, we must dwell on three such observations.

The Committee for Construction and Architecture Questions considers that the elimination of the USSR Ministry of Construction Materials Industry is premature, substantiating this with a number of reasons, including incomplete preparations of some normative acts and provisions.

A thorough additional study of this issue has shown that the raised objections are contrary to the principles of the new regional policy, as well as the transfer to democratic management methods, and take us back toward a strengthening of centralist principles in construction industry administration.

As we all know, in accordance with a decision adopted in 1988, a transfer of the contractor construction ministries and the manufacture of most building materials to the direct authority of union republics—except the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR]—has been implemented.

Eighteen months of work under these conditions have shown that in general, all republics have started to deal seriously with these issues. The programs formulated by them enable them to transfer within 2-3 years to self-provision of building materials. Thus the course of transferring the building materials industry has justified itself. This urgently dictates the necessity to also transfer to the republics the production of other materials for construction.

At the same time, in our view, we must keep the centralized production of cement and asbestos and asbestos products. And naturally there are no sufficient grounds to have a union ministry for just this limited range of products. A more realistic road here is to create several major concerns operating on democratic and financial-autonomy principles.

Of course, this circumstance, as well as the transfer of the general construction ministries to the authority of the Russian Federation, is going to change significantly the functions of the USSR State Construction Committee [Gosstroy]—but we have to go along with that if we are going to realize the new regional policy, expand the rights of the union republics, and transfer to them, in deeds and not in words, real power in the system of management. The logic of our actions at present is that we must start sharing power. That's a reality and we must take it into account.

Now about the second observation. During the sessions of some commissions and committees, ideas were expressed about the inexpediency of transferring the operation of nuclear power stations from the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Nuclear Power to the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Medium Machine Building. At the same time it is proposed not to include this sphere of activity in the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification and, having abolished the Ministry of Nuclear Power, to create the appropriate main directorate at the USSR Council of Ministers.

I must inform the people's deputies that the issue of the structure of managing nuclear power and its relationships with other national economy complexes was studied in the most thorough manner after the Chernobyl accident. The problem was so complex that at the time, we did not manage to solve it completely, although certain steps in that direction had been made. And so, considering that the technical level in nuclear power used to be significantly higher than in the USSR Ministry of Power and Electrification as a whole, and that in recent years it began to decline to the general level of that ministry, it became clear that it was necessary to separate the above-mentioned subsector from the Ministry of Power and Electrification in order to avoid the latter's continuing negative influence on the former, which is what has been done.

At the same time, the questions which allow one to approach the problems of nuclear power engineering in a comprehensive manner were not fully resolved, especially as regards safety. Research, planning, and design work; the manufacture of equipment, its assembly, and its exploitation; and the processing and storage of nuclear fuel turned out to be spread about in various ministries.

The proposed amalgamation of two ministries, along with handing over to them of production capacities from a number of other industries, is not a mechanical merger of them, but a step aimed at the comprehensive development of nuclear power engineering, and above all at ensuring nuclear safety.

Thus, this is all dictated by the most serious circumstances in the development of the country's nuclear power engineering. It is precisely from these standpoints, after the given problem has been carefully studied yet again, that the proposal is being submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet on the formation of a single USSR Ministry of Nuclear Power Generation and Industry on the basis of the USSR Ministry of Medium Machine Building. As far as its inclusion in the structure of one of the national economic complexes is concerned, this will be examined separately.

Some deputies have questioned the expediency of the existence of the USSR Ministry of Culture, considering it sufficient to have such ministries in the union republics. The following proposal has been put forward: to have in the government a first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers for questions of culture, leaving purely economic questions to the union ministry. I must say, comrades, that our opinion on this count is a unanimous one—that there should be an active union ministry of culture in the country which would be a representative with full rights of the entire diversity of the country's cultural life.

Comrades, one would wish to examine in greater detail the question of filling with new content the functions of all the bodies of state administration without exception.

The central economic bodies have been subjected to the most scathing and just criticism. What, in my view, should one take into consideration from this?

First, and foremost, one must in the shortest possible period define more precisely some of the provisions of the new regional policy that affects the economic relations between the center and the union republics. Many proposals and comments have been made here. From them follows an urgent need to return yet again to an examination of the entire complex of problems connected with the further expansion of the republic's economic independence, with the strengthening of their economic base, and with the correlation of the authoritative powers of the ministries and territories.

The acute controversy that has unfolded here over these days in commissions and committees on ways of creating a socialist market has confirmed yet again that here we shall also have to tackle difficult problems. I must say that we quite consciously chose this direction as the decisive one for accelerating the country's social and economic development; we consider it a correct and promising one, which was unanimously supported by the congress.

At the same time, the people's deputies displayed serious concern regarding the contradictory views on such an extremely important question as the regulation of market relations. In view of the fact that this subject has given rise to a large number of questions to comrades Abalkin and Maslyukov, and also to certain other candidates for senior posts in the government, I would like to express my opinion on this again.

It seems to me that what is most important, and fundamentally important, in this matter is determining the limits of state regulation of market relations. And here I am fully in agreement with the view of many people's deputies regarding the need for the central economic bodies, above all Gosplan, Gossnab, [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply] the USSR Ministry of Finance, and Goskomtsen [State Committee on Prices], jointly with the union republics, to solve two fundamentally important tasks.

The first is to develop the actual tools for regulating such relations. I have in mind the tax system, new methods of price regulation, development of wholesale trade, and so on.

The second is to create conditions, and bring into operation—figuratively speaking—limiters that will prevent such regulation from being implemented by methods that contradict the intrinsic laws of the market. We must define theoretically and practically the depth of the regulating influence upon market relations. The essential point is that the state's influence on the market must to no degree hold back its development.

It goes without saying that the solutions to both the first and the second tasks must be subordinated above all to the enhancement of the people's prosperity and the provision of their social welfare.

It is perfectly natural that when the people's deputies were discussing the new composition of the USSR Council of Ministers, they paid special attention to the work of the all-union ministries and committees. All were unanimous in feeling that the extensively developed system of narrowly sectional bodies of management has become a factor preventing radical economic reform from fully coming into its own. A few good concrete examples of this were cited. It was noted in particular that excessive centralization in decisionmaking at the union level considerably reduces the opportunities for the integrated development of the economy of the republics and the effectiveness of solving ecological problems; it does not allow the interests of the territories and their demographical and other conditions to be fully taken into account.

That is why we speak about the need to form ministries of a new kind, about imbuing their work with new content, and about transferring many of their present functions directly to the enterprises and territories. In the course of the discussion of the candidatures for the ministerial posts, many were asked by the deputies what is meant by this. It is by no means an idle question. We see the answer above all in a stringent demarcation and precise definition of the as yet still mixed functions of state management and direct economic management, of planning activity and executive activity. There is no need to argue the point that the absence of radical changes in the functions of the ministries has inhibited the shaping of progressive production structures at the basic level and, more importantly, held back the growth of the efficiency of work at that level.

At the congress and during the discussions that have been held in the commissions, we were unanimous in our aspiration to continue resolutely down the path of creating and developing interdepartmental production facilities and various types of modern organizational structures based on a combination of different forms of ownership, including ones outside the frameworks of the ministries and departments. It is precisely in this way, we believe, that we shall overcome the monopoly situation of many enterprises that has come about, and develop the principles of competitiveness and the struggle for technical perfection and quality of output.

In summing up what I have said with regard to the headquarters of the management of individual industries, the following basic conclusions can be drawn:

First and foremost we are moving quite correctly towards a consistent and profound change in their functions, by persistently amalgamating sectoral structures and delegating the rights that were formerly disposed of by the upper echelons, to the level of republican and local management bodies, and directly to the basic production link. The correctness of this policy was confirmed by the whole course of the discussion by the people's deputies of the new role of the ministries under modern management conditions. The government intends to continue along this path and hopes for all-around support for it from the USSR Supreme Soviet.

The topic of the ministry and radical economic reform deserves special discussion. I cannot but agree with the point of view expressed by a large number of deputies. Many of our ministries have indeed been slow in restructuring themselves to the development of the new principles of management, and have permitted direct violation of the demands of the law on state enterprises. All this has happened and, unfortunately, in a number of cases is still happening. The government will continue to take the most decisive measures to root out any violations of the principles of economic reform. I consider it correct and extremely useful for people's deputies to also join in actively in this most important matter.

And finally, during the discussion of the candidacies to ministerial posts, many of them were asked questions about the role of the ministries in the creation of an economic environment which would permit the most efficient development of the basic production link under

the new management conditions. They were thinking of market relations and normative documents, regional restructuring, and a whole complex of other questions.

I must say that some future ministers, instead of giving reasons for their views and standpoints on these important questions, referred to Gosplan when the subject of normative documents came up, to Gossnab when it was a question of wholesale trade, to Goskomtsen in situations connected with the galloping rise in prices for the production of some output, and to the Ministry of Finance and the banks when the conversation touched on the imbalance between the growth of wages and that of labor productivity. That is to say, a number of candidates for these high offices still are not clearly aware of their role in these most important matters. Obviously the reason is that the central economic organs have made a lot of things their exclusive province. And the government, too, up to now has not established the new principles of the ministries and departments which would have allowed for the change in role and functions under the new economic conditions.

The debate in the Supreme Soviet has confirmed once again that there are many problems in further improving the mechanism for economic management. In connection with this, as is known, it is proposed that a state commission of the USSR Council of Ministers on economic reform be set up, which will be headed, it is intended, by Academician Abalkin. His candidature has been approved by the relevant commissions and committees. I have to say straight away, comrades, that this commission is obliged to take into account all the useful things that are said at sessions aimed at ministries and departments regarding the development of economic reform but—and I shall stress this particularly—it should in no way act as a substitute for them in its work.

Given the numerous issues concerning branches of industry, I would like to single out the attention with which peoples deputies treated the discussion of the state of affairs in industries which are part of the country's military and industrial complex. And it is very correct that the main emphasis here was laid not on the achievements and high indicators for their development, but on the understanding by the candidates for the ministerial posts of the exceptional importance of measures aimed at conversion of defense production facilities, and their redesignation to the production of consumer goods, alongside the need to equip the USSR Armed Forces with the relevant hardware.

I quite agree with the deputies who have demanded from the ministries mentioned that they should direct their main efforts in the ramaining period of the present 5-year plan and throughout the next one to intensifying the social reorientation of production. We shall be obliged to assess the work of these industries in the future by the contribution that they make to satisfying the needs of the population regarding sophisticated domestic appliances, durable goods, and products in daily demand.

By the way, it was precisely from the point of view of the work under way to convert defense production facilities that the sessions of the commissions and committees examined the possibilities of a number of other ministries which must also implement the reorientation of industries towards satisfying the needs of the population even more. This concerns the machine-building complex first and foremost. We see in this that the deputies are displaying particular concern to ensure that a difficult step of this kind, upon which we are embarking in our country for the first time, is taken with profound consideration, in a short space of time, and without the bureaucratic and administrative red tape which frequently reduces to nothing the very best ventures. In connection with this, Gosplan and other economic bodies, in close collaboration with the union republics, must create the necessary conditions and remove all obstacles capable of impeding ministries and enterprises in implementing the tasks that they have been set.

Comrades, I shall not talk about the whole range of problems concerned with the building of our Armed Forces, the role of the government in this matter, and the execution of the functions placed on it by the USSR Constitution. A detailed account of this was given in the report at the congress. But, nonetheless, I would like to single out two problems that were dealt with in the relevant committee of the USSR Supreme Soviet during the examination of the program submitted by the Ministry of Defense.

The first of them is connected with defense spending. Working on the basis of the principles of the new military doctrine which has been drawn up in accordance with the mounting peace initiatives of the Soviet state, we shall consistently implement measures to reduce this expenditure. This means that our approaches toward ensuring the country's defense capability must be based solely on the requirements of reasonable sufficiency. At the committee meetings, the exchange of views about this became a serious conversation about the changes that must take place in the activity of the Defense Ministry.

Of course, the principle of reasonable sufficiency must be backed up by the further technical reequipping of the Armed Forces on a qualitatively new basis. For as long as this is forced by circumstances, we are obliged, on behalf of the government and, I think, on behalf of the people's deputies, to give the Army our support and attention by all possible means and to do everything for its prestige and authority to be strengthened and held in high regard. I believe it necessary to consider especially the proposals of people's deputies to the effect that a proportion of

resources which are being released through the reduction of spending on defense needs should be channeled to tackle the social problems of the Armed Forces.

Comrades, in the light of the fundamental conversation held in the commissions and committees during consideration of the candidacies proposed by the government for the post of the leaders of the country's law enforcement bodies, it is necessary to introduce without delay changes into their functions and practical activity. These changes must be aimed above all at making law enforcement bodies have profound respect for the freedoms and constitutional rights of Soviet citizens, act strictly within the framework of juridicial norms and regulations, direct their efforts in the interests of consolidating society, and ensure the opportunity for all citizens to live and work under conditions of security and protection from infringements by any sort of criminal elements.

In improving the situation in many krays, oblasts, and republics and in stabilizing the political situation we have all now become convinced that what is needed is not just firmness but in addition a deep, integrated approach to resolving all the problems of these regions. Otherwise manifestations like those which took place in Uzbekistan, Kazakhstan, and a number of other places are inevitable.

The law enforcement bodies, and this is perfectly clear, will not be able to do anything on their own, since not infrequently the aggravation of the situation is being influenced directly by unresolved social problems, the neglect of interethnic relations, arrant bureaucratic indifference to people's needs, an unwillingness to heed their just requests, and disregard for the opinion of the public.

The appropriate assessment was given to all of this at the Congress of People's Deputies. The time for action is now coming, and what's more not for local actions but for actions that embrace the whole range of measures: reinforcing the cadre composition of the law enforcement bodies; creating for them the necessary material and social and everyday conditions, and possibilities for raising the level of their training; improving the work of the soviets of people's deputies and their executive committees in this direction; and involving the labor collectives of enterprises and organizations in this. Serious steps must also be taken in the further improvement of the legal foundation for cutting short antisocial manifestations.

In a word, a program is needed. Its importance is evident, and its direction is clear. Work on it must be started without delay, and we will have to conduct it together. Many deputies have put it correctly: All the people have to be involved in normalizing the situation in the country and in combatting antisocial manifestations. We are going to have to do this. Without a doubt a requirement of this kind will form the basis for the activity of all law enforcement bodies and primarily the Ministry of Internal Affairs, the Ministry of Justice, and the Committee of State Security. Taking into account the growing manifestations of organized crime in the country, in our view the KGB of the USSR must involve itself in earnest with the solution to this extremely dangerous problem for society. This committee does have such opportunities.

Comrades, life shows that it is far more difficult to correct mistakes than to begin things all over again. The prolonged isolation of our society from the outside world was one of those great mistakes, and if we have made it and admitted it, then it has to be rectified quickly, effectively, and with a knowledge of the essence of the issue. It is precisely from such a viewpoint that the people's deputies considered the candidacies of comrades Kamentsev and Katushev. For overcoming the isolation of our economy from world economic links depends largely on the work of the bodies which they are faced with heading.

We have decided on the maximum expansion of the rights of enterprises in their implementation of their foreign economic activity. We have invested ministries and regions with new rights in this field and have made appropriate changes to the structure of the foreign economic bodies. All this must be persistently developed. The state foreign economic commission has the task of coordinating such work. Its role and importance will grow constantly. At the same time it is faced with a task which is new in principle. Today one must not only orient oneself well in foreign economic links and find the optimum solutions, but one must also display no less activeness in working within the country with those who are directly exporting output.

Our foreign economic bodies must fully prove themselves in their ability to bring together organically the country's possibilities and requirements, and that in which the world market has an interest.

Let me mention one other task in whose solution the State Foreign Economic Commission and the Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations must actively join. Attention was also drawn to it by the people's deputies.

In many respects the economic relations that now exist between the member countries of CEMA fall seriously behind those new principles of economic management which have recently been developing in these countries. It is perfectly obvious that without corresponding changes in the forms and methods of our interrelations, this process will increasingly lag behind, and consequently the effectiveness of the foreign economic relations of the CEMA member countries will decline.

The commission to which I have referred and the central economic bodies must work out jointly with the socialist countries a precise program of action in this sphere. At the same time it should be taken into account that integrational processes are actively taking shape in the

world economy. A line should consistently be pursued which is aimed at the further development of our world economic relations in the most varied forms, as well as at increasing participation in international financial and economic organizations.

As far as the specific proposals are concerned regarding our further steps in the sphere of credit and currency policy, foreign loans, changes in the structure of imports for the purpose of satisfying the consumer market with goods, and reducing the tension caused by shortages—all this must be carefully weighed up over and over again, and the relevant decisions must be made.

Summing up some of the results of what has been said, I would like to stress yet again that the newly formed government and the heads of ministries and departments will study most closely the deputies' proposals on the further improvement of management of the national economy, and on a change in the functions of state bodies in connection with the deepening of radical economic reform, with the subsequent transition to utilization of the entire diversity of forms of ownership and management, with the development of scientific and technical progress, and with other important problems on which I will not dwell in detail, since enough light was shed on them in the report at the congress on the government's forthcoming activity.

Undoubtedly, we will have to carry out this work in close contact with the Supreme Soviet, its commissions and committees. Of course, the order of the joint actions still needs to be worked out, as well as all kinds of questions of procedure which will arise.

Comrades, what happened at the sessions of the commissions and committees showed how responsible the process of examining candidacies for states posts has become. We have all become convinced about how difficult it is to stand on this rostrum for 2-3 hours, answering the deputies' numerous well-considered and far from simple questions. I would not say that this procedure is very pleasant, but I feel quite sure that it is necessary, and that all members of the government should go through this "purgatory."

It is also of fundamental significance that each person who passes this parliamentary exam successfully receives a vote of confidence from the people's authorized representatives. This will undoubtedly have a positive effect on the prestige of the candidates seeking leading posts and on all their future activity.

The main outcome of the work of the commissions and committees probably consists in the fact taht the deputies in principle and in the main supported the proposals submitted by the government regarding its members. At the same time six people did not receive such support. It cannot be said that they do not have the organizing abilities and professional qualities needed by leaders of this rank. However, the new requirements for candidates to have foresight with regard to promising trends in one sphere or another of socioeconomic and cultural life have sharply grown, and not all comrades proved to be suitable for such a formulation of the question. To this it must be added that sometimes demands were submitted in the commissions of a kind which we evidently had not taken sufficiently into account, and which we sometimes were simply not able to foresee. This is perfectly normal and we do not overdramatize. On the contrary, the level of exactingness, which has risen exceedingly, and the removal of indifference are true evidence of improvement in our society. When one is analyzing the discussions in the commissions and committees, this very fact itself forces one to draw some very serious conclusions and to interpret and weigh what is being proposed with even greater care.

As a result of the activity of the commissions and committees they have formulated the opinion that the following comrades should not be recommended for confirmation by the USSR Supreme Soviet: Comrade Gramov—State Committee for Sports; Comrade Zakharov—Ministry of Culture; Comrade Bogomyakov—Ministry of the Petroleum and Gas Industry; Comrade Rozenova—State Committee on Prices; Comrade Gribov—the State Bank; and Comrade Polad-Zade—Ministry of Water Industry Construction. Clearly this whould be agreed with.

In addition there was a vacancy for the State Committee for the Protection of Nature, and during the process of the work of the commissions and committees, candidacies were removed from discussion for the posts of first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, chairman of the State Commission on Provisions and Procurements, and also the minister of the machine tool and tool building industry.

Thus there are now nine vacancies in the composition of the government put forward for confirmation at the present session. Additional candidacies will be proposed to replace them in accordance with the Constitution of the USSR.

At the same time I would like to dwell on an issue which concerns not so much a candidacy for a ministerial post as the importance of the principle that it holds for the further development of one area of the national economy. It is a question of the Ministry of the Medical and Microbiological Industry. As far as the production here of medicinal remedies is concerned, this problem was discused in sharp terms at the congress and in the commissions and committees. Appropriate measures have to be taken to rectify the situation in the next few years to improve considerably the provision of medical supplies for the population.

At the same time, as is known, an extraordinarily acute situation has arisen in this industry with the production

of microbiological feed protein—protein vitamin concentrate, based on hydrocarbon raw material. A large-scale program was at one time adopted in this connection. One million tonnes of such protein are now produced in our country. It serves to make the feed balanced.

The country's public insistently raises the question both of the ecological harmfulness of the production itself and of the protein used in the feed. The question amounts to this: What is to be done in this situation?

Evidently one could divide the problem into two parts. First: to opt for suspending the further implementation of the above-mentioned program for increasing the output of the protein-vitamin concentrate type of protein to up to 2 million tonnes. For this it is necessary to abandon the intended new construction of sites and the expansion of operating enterprises for the production of 1 million tonnes of this protein in towns including Tomsk, Orenburg, Syktyvkar, Kremenchug, Pavlodar, Syzran, Saratov, Ufa, Novopolotsk, (Pyt-Yakh), and others.

In addition, I believe it fundamentally important as a specific step in the improvement of the ecological situation in a number of areas of the country to elaborate and implement measures for the consistent switching over, during the 13th 5-Year Plan period, of existing production facilities for this protein to other ecologically pure types of products.

The second part of the question is that we cannot do without resolving the problem of protein in the development of livestock farming. After all, the fact that it is unresolved leads to an annual overconsumption of 20-25 million tonnes of grain. The solution here lies in a sharp buildup of the production of vegetable protein. This is the path which is currently followed by the whole world. So far, we have fulfilled 50 percent of the intended program. The reduction in the volume of industrial protein can exacerbate the situation even more. Therefore, in adopting this decision, we must clearly realize that the main task is to build up by all means possible the production of vegetable protein in all union republics. Under these conditions, it is necessary to concentrate the efforts of the ministry mentioned above on a speedy development of the production of medicinal resources, and to back the proposal of the people's deputies to rename it the Ministry of the Medical and Biotechnological Industry of the USSR. Taking account of this, I would like to ask the USSR Supreme Soviet to consider and adopt a positive decision on the candidacy of Comrade Bykov for the post of this ministry's leader. His candidacy was discussed at the sittings of three commissions, one of which has not given a positive recommendation for the above-mentioned reasons. At the same time, all the commissions noted the high competence, professionalism, and organizational capability of Comrade Bykov. Taking account of what has been outlined, I am submitting this proposal. I am also asking that, proceeding from the discussion held at the sittings of the commissions of the USSR Supreme Soviet chambers and the Supreme Soviet committees, revised proposals be adopted on introducing changes into the law on the USSR Council of Ministers and into the draft decision on the composition of the USSR Government.

Comrades, the tasks which the new government is to tackle have been defined by the decision of the Congress of People's Deputies. Their implementation must ensure the stable and dynamic socioeconomic development of the country. This is the main program of action of the newly formed Council of Ministers of the USSR.

Ryzhkov Answers Deputies' Questions

LD2706164189 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1100 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Question-and-answer session by Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, at 27 June USSR Supreme Soviet joint session in Moscow—recorded]

[Text] [Tarazevich] Tarazevich, chairman of the Soviet of Nationalities Commission for Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations. I have looked, Nikolay Ivanovich, at the structure of the government from the point of view of the new work with which I have been entrusted by the Supreme Soviet, and I would like to put forward this question: What organ in the government will deal with matters of nationalities policy and interethnic relations, and who among your deputies being proposed will deal with these matters? And furthermore, at the 19th party conference, in the resolution on interethnic relations, it was noted: The matter should also be examined of setting up a special government organ for matters relating to nationality and interethnic relations. Has this instruction from the 19th conference been examined, and if so, then what decision has been made?

[Ryzhkov] Yes, indeed, such a decision was adopted at the 19th party conference, and I think that in the case in point the decision of the conference has been carried out, because special subdivisions have been set up in the Supreme Soviet committees and commissions on the matter in question. I am convinced that matters relating to interethnic relations have to be addressed actually in the Supreme Soviet, that is, in the supreme legislative organ of our country. As for the question as to who will deal with these problems in the Council of Ministers, I think that these problems will be dealt with by those permanent bodies which have to address all kinds of interethnic relations. They will, of course, primarily consist in deciding either the forms and methods of running the national economy, of which we have spoken a great deal here—regional financial autonomy, and so on; Academician Abalkin will be working on this, and the State Planning Committee, the entire presidium, and the chairman of the Council of Ministers, and they will also deal with the specific matters which form the brief of this or that permanent body of the Council of Ministers.

[Yablokov] Yablokov, of the Ecology Commission. Nikolay Ivanovich, a question for you in connection with the structure of state administration in the field of environmental protection, a very vexed question which was probably one of the reasons why things stand badly with ecology in our country. We know that at the moment you are not at the Council of Ministers or you, personally, offering us anyone for the post of head of the State Committee for the Protection of Nature. At the same time, I would remind you that at the time when the commission was discussing the matter of appointing Comrade Izrael—and we supported Izrael—we made a special recommendation to the Council of Ministers to examine, and we discovered for ourselves, such a remarkable man as Vitaliy (Khuseynovich Doguzhiyev), and we raised a question in this regard: Is it not possible to make the State Committee for the Protection of Nature subordinate to Doguzhiyev in the structure, tear it free from the supervision of, say, the State Agro-Industrial Committee, where it is, you understand, in a poor condition?

[Ryzhkov] The first point is that we take a very serious attitude to the candidacy for chairman and leader of the committee for nature, and you have drawn our attention to the fact that this is the only vacant post since we submitted proposals on the composition of the government. We carried out very many consultations, and we considered that at the head of this committee should stand a well-known scientist, widely educated, with a broad outlook, and who has a good knowledge of all of our ecological problems. I do not want to name names, but we offered this post to four academics and corresponding members of the Academy of Sciences, and all four refused. For this reason, in order to think these matters through attentively once again, we came to this session with the proposal of a vacant post. Regarding subordination, I think that this matter can be resolved with due account of your observation. I think that it worked out historically in this way, that at one time it formed part of the agro-industrial complex when Comrade Izrael only dealt with this matter. I think that it is possible to examine the matter and make it subordiante to Comrade (Doguzhiyev), that is, that is a sort of association, an extraordinary situation....

[Yablokov, interrupting] Ecology is catastrophic in our country, we are saying, yes, yes.

[Ryzhkov continues] ...an extraordinary situation. I think that this proposal warrants attention. It must be looked at.

[Unidentified deputy] Now, Nikolay Ivanovich, excuse me, one remark more. As the situation is unusual, on this committee alone you have not made any proposal at all. I have this proposal to make: Perhaps in the course of your work, as an exception, the Council of Ministers and you personally will come to our commission and we will have preliminary discussions with you on the possibilities of appointing candidacies.

[Ryzhkov] I will come with pleasure, and we intend, with respect to the nine nominations which are open today, that we will evidently hold very broad consultations with the deputies of the Supreme Soviet, the people's deputies, and with enterprises and organizations which, well, are involved in one problem or another.

[Unidentified speaker] Thank you.

[Ryzhkov] I consider this obligatory. Before proceeding, proposals—new proposals—have to be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Stepanov] Esteemed Nikolay Ivanovich. Deputy Stepanov, Petrozavodsk constituency. In connection with the fact that the committees and commissions did not recommend Kalashnikov for the post of first deputy minister for foodstuffs, I would like to know when a second nomination will be made, as this is a very serious issue. And a second question, a rather delicate one, but I would like to know: In connection with the reduction in the number of ministries, is an increase in pay of the minisers planned? Indeed, what is the pay of ministers?

[Ryzhkov] After the government is endorsed and the new membership starts to function, as one of our first duties, together with solving those numerous problems which have been mentioned at the congress and at the sessions of the commissions and committees—and which are being mentioned today, too—we must reach decisions more rapidly with respect to the nine candidacies for which vacancies were opened today, at least, up to this moment. What will happen to them following discussion in the Supreme Soviet is another matter. We think that these issues must be resolved before the work of the USSR Supreme Soviet session concludes, that is, in the course of July.

Concerning the pay of ministers. The salary of a minister is R800 [a month].

[Gorbachev, interrupting] No. A good collective farm chairman, excuse me, in our country gets R1,200, R1,500, R1,700.

[Ryzhkov] A minister is able to receive one and a half times his salary through the year's bonuses.

[Gorbachev] You know that the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has, at the level of preliminary information, discussed the issue of how those who have found themselves here in the Supreme Soviet are to live and work, what to base it on. And, until proposals are drawn up for preliminary discussion—because it must be resolved, these people have been left, but they have to live, just basically. All the more so in Moscow. All have felt that Moscow demands, er, [laughter in hall] certain expenditure, it must be said. [laughs]

[Ryzhkov] Chairmen of the State Committee for Prices, the State Committee for Labor, and so on have a salary of R700.

[Gorbachev] To sum up, comrades, we probably need to...[Gorbachev changes thought] This issue has come up more than once. When we go on to consider it—and we have issued instructions and we should be getting proposals on the matter of legitimate and illegal privileges, taking stock of it all.

We have to do what is necessary—and there have been preliminary proposals. The most important thing is that people should be paid. So we have to go back to this whole upper echelon and consider, so that this matter should come up for discussion in the Supreme Soviet Presidium, that certain committee chairmen should receive more, double what it was planned to offer. The same with members of the Supreme Soviet. What are we to do? That is what we are studying. I said that there are, of course, many situations. For example, I am studying the matter of the pay of party officials, which there has been a great deal of talk about. It turned out that, indeed, the secretary of a rural rayon party committee now gets—at the managerial level—when I gave the figure of R350, Comrade Veprev said: No, wait a minute. The person in charge of a section, he said, were I work, gets an average salary of R700, that is, in charge of a section on a state farm.

So where are we going to get people to be secretaries of a rayon party committee, the most authoritative, the most highly-trained, the creme de la creme? Where are we to get them? Or should it go on like this? I do not think that there should be some kind of competition, that we should set exhorbitant salaries for high-ranking officials, but this is an issue, and it needs to be worked through, and in a thorough manner. We need to think this over together. So let us reach an agreement on this, think it over, and then we will probably need a law of the Supreme Soviet on this.

[Pribylova] Deputy Pribylova from the Soviet Women's Committee. My first question: Nikolay Ivanovich, in your report you did, after all, indicate that the basic shortcoming in the work of the Ministry of the Medical Industry, and of Comrade Bykov, was in the production of vegetable protein. But aren't disposable syringes, the shortage of Soviet-made pharmaceutical preparations, of instruments, and of operating tables, and the lack of purified medicines of our own the basic shortcomings in this ministry's work? For instance, all the women who elected us noted that this is the most inhuman shortage—as is that of children's food. How do you view these negative aspects of this ministry's work? That is the first question.

The second question concerns the safety of nuclear power. When does the Council of Ministers consider that an attempt will finally be made to eliminate departmental control over ecological glasnost on the territory of nuclear power stations? I am alarmed about this in connection with the Kursk AES [nuclear electric power station], which is the spitting image of the Chernobyl AES. When will popular glasnost be ensured for the ecological situation in the region of nuclear power stations? Thank you.

[Ryzhkov] I will answer the second question right away. I think that this question will be resolved after the government has been ratified. This is our opinion: it is that the committee which has to supervise safety in nuclear power engineering—as you know, we have one, for the industry and for power engineering—must, in our view, be withdrawn from the complex where nuclear power and power engineering in general are developed, and transferred to a state commission for extraordinary situations, in order that this should be a neutral body which is not subordinate to some deputy or some standing body engaged in the use of nuclear stations.

As far as Comrade Bykov and his ministry are concerned—and you draw attention to the fact that there are not only problems with regard to protein vitamin concentrates but also with others—yes, there is an immense number of problems there. I have to say that previously we met only 35 percent of the demand through our own medicines. Today we meet 45 percent through our own production. Forty-five! We buy 35 percent in CEMA member countries, through our long-term agreements. The rest either remains deficit, or else we find some rubles to buy it for freely-convertible currency, or through the clearing system somewhere, say, in India, and so on.

We consider that there is a very serious lag here, and we must all raise this issue. In my report I said that we must solve these problems in the near future, the problems of ensuring medicines for the population, and perhaps take the step of purchasing several enterprises, however difficult things are with currency—let us consult on this—and construct them on a ready-for-occupation basis. Three or four enterprises could abruptly change the production of medicines.

But comrades, the following trend is taking place today: We cannot allocate any factory or plant for the manufacture of medicine or medical preparations. No one wants to be allocated one, as they say. They all say: You give us the medicines, but making them and where you make them are your business. This is a trend toward the closure of plants which manufacture the most necessary medicines—aspirin, and so on; the closure of these enterprises is taking place. Let us take a look: It really is necessary to improve or alter the technology in some places, but if we move along the line of closing down enterprises which are already in operation, and do not build new ones, we will not change the situation, however much we criticize Comrade Bykov, or whoever else is the minister. I agree that a great deal of work must be done on this matter, but clearly all the regions must work on it.

With regard to disposable syringes, this problem is indeed acute. Unfortunately, we have fallen behind here. We did not fulfill what we were supposed to last year. We have examined this matter very seriously. Incidentally, the Politiburo has examined this problem, and the Council of Ministers has investigated it twice in very great depth, as they say. What can I say? There are machine-building ministries, there are our scientists, technologists, and designers, who have said that it is possible to create technology of our own which would produce disposable syringes excellently. We have not yet received such technology. We are now forced once again to pile up a debt of R50 million in order to buy the technology abroad to organize disposable syringes. I can say one thing: that everything that is supposed to be done according to this year's resolution will be ensured. If I am not mistaken, this is 5 million syringes and needles. For next year—more than 1 billion syringes, although I may be mistaken—we will also create the capacities and ensure output. Thus, I think that we shold shortly move over and begin to strictly fulfill the decisions which have been taken.

Gorbachev Delivers Concluding Speech 27 Jun

LD2706181989 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1330 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Concluding speech by Mikhail Gorbachev, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, at the Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses in Moscow on 27 June—recorded]

[Text] I want to sum up the general considerations, both to remind you how the discussion developed and in order to decide how we shall act. However, I will start with the speech by Comrade Denisov. Despite the academic touch—which is understandable because Comrade Denisov represents the scientific world in our country—his speech contained many convincing arguments as to the way that we should approach the formation of this system which we shall call the Council of Ministers, that sphere of social administration. I think that in general the ideas that Comrade Denisov expressed here should be borne in mind. They have something in common with the proposals made by the deputies that were expressed. However, I won't mention any names here because several deputies spoke of it and we are evidently destined now, for all that, to adopt the proposals of the Council of Ministers, knowing all the weaknesses which were mentioned here at the Supreme Soviet. We should immediately—there should clearly be a legal addendum to this law—and without delay draw up instructions for a new law on the Council of Ministers, taking into account both this exchange of opinions and the study which will follow, and properly speaking, is being carried out, which Nikolay Ivanovich mentioned while speaking about the new functions of the ministries. If, I think, we add to this decision a clause with the following instruction—that work should start immediately after its adoption, so that work starts from the time of its adoption—if we add a clause that a new law be drawn up and passed by the end of the year, then we can already resolve the matter now. For any other approach would at the present time draw us into a lengthy study or, on the other hand, into decisions that are too hasty and may turn out to be no less mistaken than a number of other decisions that we have already adopted in a situation like this. I think that in this respect it would be possible to implement the general idea in this way because I see that, for all that, not everything that is being introduced at the present time in the Supreme Soviet is satisfactory.

Now what did the comrades think about the discussion—to be or not to be, to unite the ministries or not? Perhaps we shoud deal with this in this manner. You see, we are doing this, making the ministries bigger, on one condition—that this definitely fits in organically with the change in the functions of the ministries. If we just build them up mechanically and leave all their functions unchanged, it would be total nonsense, to put it quite bluntly. That would be supercentralization, which would ruin everything and create a bureaucratic superstructure, so to speak, which would itself be totally inflexible.

Therefore I think that when the government introduces—and I understood it like this from Nikolay Ivanovich—that when it introduces this enlargement—I think there was a report on this at the plenum and Nikolay Ivanovich did sort of consult the plenum; you know about that, and that question was also discussed at the plenum; that is, properly speaking, the policy in the sphere of our economic construction and therefore it falls within the sphere of the party's activity—I formed the opinion that it concerns the enlargement and amalgamation of ministries connected simultaneously with the fact that the functions of the ministries will be seriously changed in the very near future. Therefore there simply cannot be any other approach. If that were not the case, it would simply be a venture that no one needed at all. I would thereby like to remove the objections of those comrades who are afraid that in the event of the enlargement we shall lose control and it will be difficult to resolve vital questions in these supercentralized and gigantic ministries, and that this will lead to an even greater deterioration of the situation.

You know, somehow I have got the impression a little that everyone, except the reader of the report, discussed that question forgetting, for all that, the main point: decentralization via the implementation of the provisions in the law on enterprises—the decentralization that we are establishing in connection with the transition to republican financial autonomy, with the broadening of rights and giving fuller sovereignty to the republics in their transition to financial autonomy. That also, so to speak, takes away a great deal from the ministries and the center. We have become distracted from that and have simply started from the standpoint of how life will be for the enterprise now. Won't it transpire that we shall create such large ministries that there will be nowhere to get problems solved, or it will be difficult for people to

get through to the minister and his colleagues, so to speak? I think that we have forgotten about that. However, if for all that, we are moving along the path of developing the economic independence of enterprises, if we are traversing the path of expansion—and a considerable expansion moreover—all major economic activity should essentially take place in the republics. We thereby resolve the tasks of making fuller those sovereign rights that have long been proclaimed, but have so to speak hung in the air, because we did not decentralize the functions, but on the contrary even centralized them the whole time here in the supreme bodies. And if we are laying the basis for this process, and we are, you see, laying it—the second stage consists of this, incidentally—one must also add that the local soviets should also develop their potential to cooperate with all enterprises on the basis of the new law on local authority and the self-government of local bodies. That is a completely different medium which these ministries should work in. In other words, they must radically alter their functions, comrades. This is why this kind of amalgamation is justified.

Finally, there was a debate about the ministries—the Ministry of Culture, for instance. Here, some felt that the existence of such a ministry was again an obstacle to the development of national cultures, for the flourishing and strengthening, for the development and revival and strengthening of the traditions of each of the peoples of our country. All the same, I think, comrades, that this process is going to develop very dialectically in our country. On the one hand, we shall undoubtedly-...[changes thought] We shall be unable to guarantee the conditions for giving vitality to our fedration and for satisfying the interests of all the people it brings together unless we provide broad scope for the development of all peoples, including, naturally, the development of people's language and culture and the preservation and strengthening of their traditions. At the same time, however, there will be a process of broad exchanges going on in that federation. This will involve exchanges, comparisons, and joint undertakings, which will enrich the culture of each people and, overall, the entire spiritual life of our federation. If we were to take one direction alone, this would be a path to solitude and self-isolation, and any self-isolation leads to restrictions on the development opportunities of each people and nation.

This is true of all spheres, not only of culture. It is, therefore, a very dialectical process. Given this, given that these processes are real ones—and I think that real life must be our starting point in tackling the issue of what the administrative structure should be like—there will have to be some coordinating functions for the center in the sphere of culture as well, something to promote, so to speak, this coming-together and the exchanges. For this is in our interests, that all peoples and all of us together feel at ease in the federation. I just cannot imagine this not encompassing the sphere of culture as well; I cannot imagine it. If that were the case then we ought to admit, or agree that we are opposed to the federation, against the federation. That is a different matter. However, for the present it's our intention to live together in the framework of the federation so that each people is underpinned by the tremendous might and all the capabilities we possess—natural, scientific-technical, cultural, and so on. So this, as I see it, is the kind of dialectic we have. I think this is in line with the interests of the peoples, so we ought to wind up this debate. I think it's an important issue, and I'm not sure, as some are saying, that if we are to have a Ministry of Culture it should take the form of a body that handles material and technical supply. I don't think so. If we feel today that we live in an interconnected world, that we are very dependent on one another, that in order to live in this civilization and preserve it and reveal its potential we must make contact with one another, must exchange cultures, compare values and enrich one another, then how on earth can we have any other approach in our federation? It just doesn't make any sense. I don't think it stands up either theoretically or practically, or from the point of view of common sense, to pose the question in that way. So I expressed my opinion straightaway, listening and thinking about this debate. Well, the fact that it has taken place is, I think, actually a good thing, because it sharpens our thinking, it deepens our understranding, especially of such a question as culture, the sphere of culture. I think that life, not just us personally and subjectively, but life, is in favor of there being such a ministry, seeing that the debate has assumed such a scale and the question of the fate of this ministry has emerged. I think it is needed.

So, what questions are left to us regarding the structure? I think that everything that was said should be with dealt exhaustively in a point which the law should definitely register. There is already such a point, actually, No 2, saying that the USSR Council of Ministers should be instructed, taking into account the proposals of the USSR people's deputies, to draft a new law on the USSR Council of Ministers and submit it for examination at the autumn 1989 session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. So what we are proposing now should be decided, and a point should be registered so that everything the deputies said is thoroughly thought over, so that one can move onto the new law and get down to work from there.

Naturally, at some stage or other the Council of Ministers, by way of consultations and collective debate, will state its own proposals already at the stage before the first reading, and the commission can then debate everything.

Lukyanov's 27 Jun Supreme Soviet Speech

LD2806133289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1745 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Speech by Anatoliy Ivanovich Lukyanov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet; followed by closing remarks by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, USSR Supreme Soviet chairman; from the broadcast of the 27 June proceedings of the USSR Supreme Soviet session held in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses—recorded]

[Text] [Lukyanov] A note from several chairmen of Supreme Soviet committees and of standing commis-

sions of the chambers has been forwarded to the Supreme Soviet Presidium, which says: We ask you and those in charge of the chambers to decide upon the question concerning the procedure of work of the Supreme Soviet, its chambers, committees and commissions, and the question of the order of adoption of decisions by the committees and commissions.

In the first place, in connection with the fact that as of the start of the 2d week of the USSR Supreme Soviet's work the center of gravity in this work is being transferred to the committees and commissions of the chambers, a procedure under which 2-week periods will be made available for the work of the committees and commissions, alternating with the same periods of Supreme Soviet work—or else each day of the Supreme Soviet's work will be so arranged that the 1st half of the day will be given over to committees and commissions, while the 2d half will be given over to Supreme Soviet chambers' sittings—is, in our view, the best possible procedure.

This matter requires to be solved forthwith, because dozens of the out-of-town and unemployed members of the commissions and committees who are not Supreme Soviet members are currently in Moscow, waiting for this one and only day set aside for the commissions and committees. The next such day is 7 July.

In the second place, practical experience shows that the voting procedure adopted by the Supreme Soviet, involving the counting of votes according to the composition as in the lists, has turned out to be unacceptable for the work of the committees and commissions. Half of the members of the commissions and committees are not Supreme Soviet members. Not all of them are able to participate in the sittings. Practically about 50 percent of such Supreme Soviet members are absent...[Lukyanov corrects himself] members of the commissions and committees are permanently absent.

Taking account of the deputies who are absent due to illness and other valid reasons, the voting procedure that has been adopted considerably hampers the work of the commissions and committees, and leads to a situation in which a qualified majority of three-quarters or four-fifths of persons participating in the voting is required for a positive decision to be adopted.

In connection with this we ask that the question of altering the voting procedure in commissions and committees be forwarded for examination by the Supreme Soviet. A proposal is submitted whereby sittings of the USSR Supreme Soviet committees or those of the chamber commissions should be regarded as valid in law if more than half of their member deputies were present at them. The committee or the commission can adopt a decision to have certain questions examined in the presence of no less than two-thirds of their composition. Moreover, the decision is adopted by a simple majority of votes of the members of the given Supreme Soviet committee or of the chamber commission present at the sitting.

We discussed this question, too, comrades. In all probability there is, evidently, no sense in interrupting now the session for 2 weeks, to be followed by 2 weeks of the commissions' work.

It is, however, proposed that an apparently preferable system should be examined, a system whereby, say, the Supreme Soviet could now work during the 1st half of the day, while the committees and commissions could work during the 2d half; and when the chief bulk of the work is transferred to the committees and commissions, these could work during the 1st half of the day and the Supreme Soviet would convene for 2 hours, and this would go on for some period of time.

As for the proposals tied up with the voting in the commissions and committees of the chambers, these could be supported here at the session.

And the last matter—Mikhail Sergeyevich, can I read it, this is also addressed to the presidium: Is it not possible to find out who revoked the congress' decision concerning the live relay from the Supreme Soviet session? Will the recording be relayed, I mean, well, in an uncut form?

Already I spoke about this yesterday, and I told the chamber's deputies that the Supreme Soviet Presidium, with the participation of all the chairmen of the commissions and of the committees, adopted the following decision: Taking account of the fact that, first, the congress did not decide upon the matter of relaying the Supreme Soviet—it merely decided on the matter of live relays from the congress, and this was adhered to in the strictest manner—and, moreover, according to the data received from the provinces, very many people were torn away from production work for a very great deal of the time, and up to 20 percent of output was lost in places—in connection with this the following proposal was put foward, and the presidium listened to the Radio and Television Committee chairman on this issue, and the following solution was put forward: In the first place, to broadcast the chambers' sittings in an abbreviated form, all the more so because chambers can sit simultaneously at times. As for the most important Supreme Soviet sittings, such broadcasts are put out live, as is the case today in connection with the formation of the government—but all these broadcasts ought to be put out on the Second Television Program in the evening, so as to not tear people away from work. Well, this is the proposal put foward by the Radio and Television Committee, and it was supported by the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and I told one of the chambers about this yesterday. [noises from hall]

[Gorbachev] No, just a moment, comrades. I would now complete the entire discussion on this issue. Well, the information given by Comrade Lukyanov is for reflection. Do think about it; one must still think about it. Let us urge...[Gorbachev changes thought] Let the chairmen of the committees and the commissions have a think, let the chairmen of the chambers and all deputies have a think. Once the question of the formation of the Government has been decided, we shall find 2 hours and devote one sitting to, well, discussing these questions. I have in mind combining the work of the chambers with the work of the committees and commissions. I think that if, so to put it, proposals that have been thought through are to be made at the sittings of the chambers and, all the more, at the Supreme Soviet session, then the opportunities for the work of the commissions and committees—I have here in mind the time frame—must altogether be expanded. When all is said and done, preparatory work must be carried out there. Otherwise we shall have this all the time that we carry out work within the framework of the session, the selfsame work that ought to have been carried out in committees.

[Unidentified speaker] Correct.

[Gorbachev] That is why this has now been done—so that you can now think this matter over. And now the sitting is declared closed. We are meeting tomorrow at 1000 here. All the best!

Correspondent Reports From 27 Jun Supreme Soviet

'Active Work' in Recess Noted

LD2706141889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] As you know, comrades, the USSR Supreme Soviet session continued its work in the Kremlin today. At 1800 [1400 GMT] on Radio Channel Two we will begin broadcasting a recorded relay from today's sitting of the session. All-Union Radio correspondents are working at the Kremlin. Over to Aleksandr Ruvinskiy:

[Ruvinskiy] The session is back at work now following a recess, but to begin my story I will go back a little way. During the recess the deputies not only had lunch—as indeed they should—but also gathered in commissions and committees to disseminate information and urgently resolve important issues. For example, our agrarian committee is planning to find time on Friday for meetings with scientists. That was what they discussed.

Recess is the time of the most active work for the press, too. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov was surrounded here in the foyer by Soviet and foreign journalists, who asked him all sorts of questions. When will the vacancies in the government be filled? What is the salary of a minister? A committee chairman? And many other questions were asked.

What is happening at the session now? The debate on the structure of the government and its personnel composition is continuing. There are a great many deputies who want to speak, but in speaking they often depart from the main subject and Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who is in the chair, periodically calls on them to concentrate on the subject under discussion.

One half hour ago, Deputy Stadnik proposed that the general debate be ended and tha they should move on to the adoption of a law on the structure of the Council of Ministers and on personal candidatures. All in all, the deputies approved that solution by a majority of votes.

Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev took the floor and proposed that the structure be adopted, while at the same time starting to prepare a new law on the Council of Ministers with a view to considering it at the end of this year. Also in his speech was a discussion of the new functions of the all-union ministries and of their relationships with the republics. Special attention was devoted to the role and state of the Ministry of Culture, since some deputies have spoken in favor of abolishing the ministry.

Just now, Deputy Khajiyev had the floor. He also spoke about the structure of the government, but in addition, he dwelt on the following—to my mind very important— issue. The republics—in particular Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan, where disturbances recently were perpetrated—should reimburse the victims for their material and moral losses from their own resources. The deputies greeted these words with applause. The sitting is still continuing and I will now conclude my report from the USSR Supreme Soviet session.

Ryzhkov Questioned During Break

LD2806090789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] [Announcer Vladimir Bezyayev] The Supreme Soviet will continue its work in the Kremlin today. At a joint sitting of the chambers the deputies will start discussing proposals on the USSR Council of Ministers personnel composition. Let me remind you that Comrade Ryzhkov spoke at the session yesterday. When his report was discussed, there was a pointed debate on measures to reorganize the management system for the national economic complex. A law on amending the USSR Law on the USSR Council of Ministers was adopted at the session. Listen now to a recording which was made in the Kremlin yesterday by our correspondent Aleksandr Ruvinskiy:

[Ruvinskiy] The very same democratic atmosphere which accompanied all the Congress of People's Deputies sessions is being maintained here at the session. Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov was surrounded during a break by both deputies and Soviet and foreign journalists. Listen to an extract from this conversation:

[Begin recording] [First unidentified speaker] Was your work easier before these commissions and committees?

[Ryzhkov] I will tell you that you must get used to that. Of course, a great deal of restructuring will be required, both in executive authority—in this case the Council of Ministers—and I think, too, that the Supreme Soviet and its committees and commissions will have to find methods of working. Therefore, much has to be worked out in all the principles for work in these two organs of legislative and executive power. Let me clearly state that it will be easier for executive authority, in this case the USSR Government, to work when there are more laws. We are very often criticized for sometimes adopting government decisions one after another; we adopt a lot of decisions because there are not a lot of laws. When there are more laws, we will adopt fewer decisions. And once there are fewer decisions, I will let fewer mistakes slip through. Therefore, I am in favor of the legislative organ working very fruitfully, of there being more laws and of their being fully thought through. That will be the basis of the executive authority's work. And so, I am very eager for there to be more laws as quickly as possible; it will be easier for me to work.

[First speaker] The deputies learned today for the first time that ministers' salaries will be R800. What the salary will be in the future is evidently something which the Supreme Soviet will have to settle. It will need to be settled as an overall package—what salary legislators will have and what salary ministers will get.

[Second unidentified speaker] Everybody knows that the salary is not important here. It is the privileges which are important—sanatoria, cars, and so on.

[Ryzhkov] He has a basic privilege: It is that he must work well. There is a car, but what other privileges are there? All the rest is the same as any other citizen. They pay taxes at 13 percent and they pay for their apartments. Privileges from the point of view of food and so on have all now been removed. They were all eliminated several months ago. You heard it said at the congress that sanatoria and hospitals in the fourth main directorate should have the same things as all the other sanatoria and hospitals in our country. And so, there will not be any privileges there either, now.

[Third unidentified speaker] Nikolay Ivanovich, how do you interpret the fact that deputies are digressing so widely in their questions and speeches from the subject of today's session?

[Ryzhkov] You know, I sat for almost a week in this hall while they discussed some members of the government. I came to the following conclusion: If people were speaking on the 1st day, by the last day the same people—the deputies who spoke—were already completely different. They began to show a state-minded approach. There were fewer private questions: They were beginning to rise up to state problems. This is a very positive phenomenon. Therefore, it takes time for people to pour out what they have inside them and to come up to the state level and the solution of state problems.

[Third speaker] What do you think about the fact that some comrades spoke today in defense of their ministries?

[Ryzhkov] I think that the proposals being submitted—to keep one ministry, another, or a third—are simply based on fear, fear of the new: lest they should be dissolved and lose their control, and so on. In my opinion, we have submitted the best administration to this session. I think that subsequently, of course, we will go further in reducing ministries. But we have to improve the whole mechanism. We have to adopt a very subtle approach here. On the one hand, we must not lose control over the national economy; on the other, we must not be conservative, lest we stifle economic reform. Therefore, I think that this is the correct process.

[Fourth unidentified speaker] Nikolay Ivanovich, candidates for ministerial posts are selected by you....

[Ryzhkov interrupting] Yes.

[Fourth speaker] ...and the Supreme Soviet merely confirms them. What do you think about taking into account the opinions of deputies? Some farmers have just gathered here. They are planning, I know, to recommend or to ask you to make Agrarian Committee Chairman Vasiliy Starodubtsev your deputy.

[Ryzhkov] Well, the whole procedure for selecting and confirming cadres is stipulated by the Constitution. Indeed, the Council of Ministers chairman makes his proposals for particular state posts. Now, six people have not received the confidence of or recommendations in the committees and commissions, and I removed two people during the discussion. That was during the discussions in the committees and commissions. Where do we go from here? To go further, a cycle will also begin. We have to determine new candidates and submit them again to the Supreme Soviet; the Supreme Soviet will again instruct the respective chambers to examine them and to go through what we have gone through in this period. How are we to approach the matter from the point of view of selecting cadres? I think that we need to hold more consultations, including with USSR Supreme Soviet deputies. We need to ask their advice: Who do they consider worthy to hold a particular state post? Evidently we also need to hold more consultations with directors of enterprises. If it has to do with culture, then evidently we must hold more consultations with public organizations; so that, when the government nominates a particular candidate, it has already been approved to a certain extent by many people. So, this process needs, as they say now, to be set in motion again; and I think that as soon as the government is confirmed we will start

dealing with this issue. The task is for these nine vacancies—nine, so far—to be filled in July—in other words, for the comrades to start work.

[Fourth speaker] In other words, you are not yet naming specifically the people and their posts?

[Ryzhkov] No, no. This needs to be thought through. They are very important posts and there needs to be thorough work done on them before they are submitted. I cannot say anything today on any specific candidate. That would be premature. [end recording]

TASS Reports on 27 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings

Proposed Government Debated

LD2706150189 Moscow TASS in English 1407 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

How many and which ministries the Soviet Union needs is a most controversial question, as debates in the country's new parliament have shown.

After Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov made a report today on the structure and make-up of his suggested government to the legislature, opposing proposals clashed in the very first few comments from the floor.

Some Supreme Soviet deputies suggested that the projected cut in the number of ministries (40 percent in the case of sectoral ministries in industry) is too dramatic, while others seek an even more radical streamlining of the government.

Garri Shtoyk from Kazakhstan, for example, objected to the proposed merger of the ministries of ferrous and non-ferrous metallurgy as contradicting the drive against monopolist trends in the economy.

He was supported by Boris Blayev from Kabardino-Balkariya, while Tuva's Yuriy Komarov opposed the abolition of the Building Materials Industry Ministry.

Lithuanian deputy Romas Gudajtis saw the remaining national culture ministry, just as the public education committee, as a challenge to constituent republics' sovereignty. He called for using the money spent on the two agencies to maintain orphanages.

Well-known poet Yuliya Drunina took issue with Gudajtis, dismissing his arguments as "strange" and insisting that the Culture Ministry is especially badly needed as it is imperative to restore the cultural foundation of society.

A number of deputies commented on individual nominees for ministerial posts. Leningrad deputy Anatoliy Denisov, for example, praised the "Shevardnadze team", hailing the results of Mikhail Gorbachev's recent visit to West Germany and stressing the need to proceed from confrontation to partnership with that major country, which is a NATO member.

Backing Aleksandra Biryukova for the post of a deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers, Alikhan Atadzhanov from Uzbekistan asked her to ensure that the bureau for social development headed by her more rapidly adopt economic rather than administrative methods of management.

With a number of deputies lacking parliamentary experience, Supreme Soviet debates often veered away from the agenda. This is why President Gorbachev, before announcing a break, appealed to the Supreme Soviet members to abide by the agenda item, namely the structure and make-up of the Council of Ministers.

Council of Ministers Endorsed

LD2706172489 Moscow TASS in English 1635 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent reporting from the Kremlin:

After a debate of many hours held today at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet on the report of head of the Soviet Government Nikolai Ryzhkov, the deputies endorsed the new structure of the USSR Council of Ministers comprising some 60 ministries and state committees.

During the evening meeting Ryzhkov had to take the floor more than once to substantiate the need for preserving and merging some or other ministries, to set out their specific features and functions and turn down unjustifiable statements. For instance, he disagreed with the assertion made during the debate that the Council of Ministers keeps apart from tackling the food problem. He said that the importance attached by the Council of Ministers to this problem is shown by the very fact of setting up a state commission on food and purchases under the supervision of the first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers. As to the proposal to form a committee on land tenure, the head of the government said that what is needed is not a committee but a clearly formulated law on land tenure.

Summing up the results of the debate, President of the USSR Supreme Soviet Mikhail Gorbachev also dwelt on the question of the merger of a number of ministries and agencies. He explained that this is not an automatic enlargement of sections of the administrative apparatus, but altering its main functions. Otherwise, this would only lead to overcentralisation which can only jeopardise the undertaking and create a new bureaucratic superstructure.

Touching upon the proposal to eliminate the Ministry of Culture, made by several Baltic representatives during the debate, the Soviet leader pointed to the need of giving much room in the country for the activity toward the development of all nations, their languages and culture. He emphasized that there is a need for the coordinating centre in the area of culture which would promote rapprochement and exchange among all nations and peoples of the USSR. It is precisely such functions that the USSR Ministry of Culture should assume.

As a result of separate voting, both chambers endorsed the structure of the Council of Ministers which will take into consideration the realities that manifested themselves as a result of the economic reform and transition to regional cost-accounting.

28 Jun Supreme Soviet Proceedings Reported

Government Composition Deliberated

LD2806065489 Moscow TASS in English 0647 GMT 28 Jun 89

[TASS parliamentary correspondent report]

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—This morning the USSR Supreme Soviet resumed the consideration of the composition of the Soviet Government. A joint session of the chambers is being presided over by Mikhail Gorbachev, president of the Supreme Soviet.

Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov presented a new list of government members to parliament on June 10. A majority of the nominations were upheld following scrutiny in the parliamentary committees and commissions of the chambers.

Ryzhkov, who on Tuesday reported to Supreme Soviet the results of the consideration of the candidacies, said that the six candidates who had been turned down by the committees and commissions would be replaced by others.

On Tuesday the parliament endorsed a new structure of the USSR Council of Ministers, substantially reducing the number of ministries, primarily at the expense of sectoral ones.

The number of ministries is cut by 40 per cent in industrial sectors. At the same time proposals by several deputies from the Baltic region to abolish the Ministry of Culture and the public education committee and transfer their functions to the republics were turned down.

A majority of deputies were of the opinion that such all-union bodies are essential to ensure mutual enrichment of the national cultures of the peoples of the Soviet Union.

Deputy Chairmen Endorsed

LD2806095989 Moscow TASS in English 0952 GMT 28 Jun 89

[TASS parliamentary correspondent report from the Kremlin]

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—The Soviet Parliament today confirmed as First Deputy Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers Lev Voronin, 61, and Yuriy Maslyukov, 52. Maslyukov held the same position in the previous government and will also retain his post as chairman of the State Planning Committee. Voronin, who served as a deputy chairman, will now be responsible for general issues.

One position of first deputy chairman remains vacant. Premier Nikolay Ryzhkov has not as yet selected a candidate.

Maslyukov, Voronin Questioned

LD2806112789 Moscow TASS in English 1058 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—By TASS parliamentary correspondent:

The USSR Supreme Soviet, at a joint sitting of the chambers on Wednesday [28 June], began to endorse government nominations on a person-by-person basis.

The structure of the Council of Ministers had been endorsed by the Parliament on Tuesday [27 Jun]. The discussion began with the consideration of candidatures for two posts of first deputy chairmen and ten posts of deputy chairmen of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The deputies discussed at length the nomination of Yuriy Maslyukov for the post of first deputy prime minister and the chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee. It must be recalled that he had been 'grilled' by deputies for more than four hours at a joint meeting of the parliamentary committees and commissions of the chambers last week.

Today Maslyukov again had to give answers to questions ranging from the principles of planning and the introduction of regional cost accounting to the problem of the preservation of the monuments of culture.

For example, he was asked questions connected with defence industry conversion. Maslyukov said that government proposals on general principles for conversion would be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet by the end of the year.

The resources of defence plants for the production of consumer goods have been determined already now. They are to turn out an aggregate of 15,000 million roubles worth of goods in 1989-90, he said.

At the same time Maslyukov emphasized that conversion did not mean disarmament. It should not be viewed in this sense as long as NATO countries have not abandoned plans to upgrade nuclear weapons, tactical ones, in particular, he said. Therefore one can now speak only of partial utilisation of the capacities of defence industry sectors for peaceful purpose.

In answer to the question about an alleged dumping of radioactive wastes from the nuclear power stations of socialist countries in Transcarpathian region (Ukraine), Maslyukov voiced doubt about the reliability of the assertions.

Maslyukov's candidature was supported in speeches made by Mikhail Bronstein, an economist from Estonia, Albert Likhanov, a writer (Moscow), and by other deputies.

By a majority of votes the country's parliament confirmed the nomination of Yuriy Maslyukov as the first deputy head of government and the chairman of the USSR State Planning committee.

The nomination of Lev Voponin as yet another first deputy prime minister was endorsed (?today). He will tackle general matters.

In his speech he singled it out as one of the main tasks of his future activities to organise control over the fulfilment of the government's decisions.

Voronin said he also intends to devote special attention to the development of the social orientation of the country's economy and the saturation of the market with consumer goods.

Economist Abalkin Questioned

LD2806145289 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Excerpts] We are at the session of the USSR Supreme Soviet. An All-Union radio correspondents' center is operating in the Kremlin. Igor Zorin is at the microphone. [passage omitted]

[Zorin] At present, the session has only approved three candidacies: two first deputies of the chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers—Lev Alexayevich Voronov, let me note that he will be Comrade Ryzhkov's deputy for general matters; and Yuriy Dmitriyevich Maslyukov, he is chairman of USSR Gospan—and the candidacy for deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Academician Leonid Ivanovich Abalkin; he will also be chairman of the Commission on Economic Reform of the USSR Council of Ministers. [passage omitted]

The deputies listened very attentively to our very great economist Academician Abalkin. In my opinion, he was asked the hardest questions, both about the agenda and on issues which were sore points for the deputies. However, each time they received a frank and exhaustive answer. This does not mean, however, that his answers were really the last word—for instance, a collective farm chairman and economist from Lithuania argued with him. Assessing the standard of living in the country, Comrade Abalkin noted that we live no worse than we work. A philosophical and practical answer. In his words, 12 to 15 million people will have to be released from the production sphere and employed in the service sphere in order to eliminate economic stagnation by the year 2000. That is, there is an acute question of redistribution of the work force between sectors, from the state sector to the cooperative sector and the sector of individual labor activity. In response to the question of whether he would hand in his resignation together with the government if it is not possible to pull the country out of the economic decline in 1 ½ to 2 years, Academician Abalkin said that in 1 ½ to 2 years, he and his Commission on Economic Reform must activate changes, perhaps even with the help of extraordinary measures, but without fail within the framework of the law. Otherwise the credit of confidence would melt. This credit is not infinite, after all, and for this reason, he repeated, we must improve the country's economy.

During my report from the Kremlin, the Supreme Soviet session has voted for Comrade Abalkin's candidacy for the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. Debates are now under way on the candidature of Igor Sergeyevich Belousov for the post of deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers. The sphere of his interests, as they say, is the military-industrial complex. The evening sitting of the session is being conducted by Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev, who earlier had requested a leave of absence of the deputies in order to leave the session for a meeting with Comrade Honecker.

Deputies Discuss Candidates Before Supreme Soviet

PM2806091389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 24 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 1-2

[Article by IZVESTIYA special correspondents A. Gronov, V. Dolganov, M. Kushtapin, R. Lynev and A. Stepovoy under the rubric "In the USSR Supreme Soviet Committees and Commissions": "Examination for a Minister"]

[Excerpts] There is not much time left before the new USSR Supreme Soviet session is resumed, and there are still plenty of questions which have not been examined in the committees and commissions. The deputies are so scrupulous and principled in their approach to the discussion of each candidate for a post in the future government that they are not keeping to any of the sittings' proposed timetables.

G. Gabrielyants, candidate for the post of USSR minister of geology, reported to the deputies on how he sees prospects for developing geology. The economy, which until now has been mainly expenditure-oriented and extensive in character has relied on a geology which accords with this character.

The candidate minister set out proposals whose essence is that geology must become a sector which is, first, economically accountable [khozraschetnyy] from top to bottom, and which works not on the basis of budgetary funds, but entirely on the basis of credit funds, building all its relations with clients, territories, and local soviets on a contractual basis. Second, it must not only study mineral resources, but also protect them. Third, it has to become a sector of scientific and technical progress, which should drastically increase its efficiency.

Let us note that the hardest questions put to the contender were precisely from these spheres—ecology and scientific and technical progress.

The answers were specific and knowledgeable. And the commission decided to recommend G. Gabrielyants for the post of USSR minister of geology.

The same decision was made unanimously as regards V. Chirskov, the present USSR minister of construction of petroleum and gas industry enterprises. There is no particular secret here: Lately the sector headed by him has developed more dynamically than many others. The candidate minister is a recognized authority in his field.

The economic soundness and realism of decisions, the comprehensive consideration of man's interests, and nature conservation were the crucial points which most interested the deputies who are conducting a very exacting "selection of ministers." These points were, alas, rather weak in the presentation of F. Bogomyakov, first secretary of the Tyumen Oblast CPSU committee, who was a candidate for the post of USSR minister of the petroleum and gas industry. The deputies decided not to recommend G. Bogomyakov to be part of the government. [Passage omitted]

In the Malyy Hall of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium building members of the Committee for the Protection of People's Health and the Commission for Labor, Prices, and Social Policy Questions discussed the candidacy of V. Bykov for the post of USSR minister of the medical and microbiological industry. Jumping ahead a bit, we shall say that this contender has been recommended as minister conditionally, so to speak—in a year's time he will have to report to the present sitting's participants on the work he has done. Too many problems have accumulated in this sector and they are not being solved fast enough.

At a joint sitting of the Commission for Questions of the Development of Culture, Language, National and International Traditions, and Protection of the Historical Heritage; the Committee for Science, Public Education, Culture, and Upbringing; and also the Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals there was an examination of the candidacies for the posts of chairmen of two USSR state committees—the State Committee for Cinematography [Goskino] and the State Committee for the Press [Goskompechat] (the former State Committee for Publishing Houses, Printing Plants and the Book Trade). Here A. Kamshalov (Goskino) and N. Yefimov (Goskompechat) won the deputies' sympathies for their great competence, and their ability to defend their viewpoint without avoiding critical questions. Not one of the deputies objected to their candidacies, although the discussion was both detailed and principled.

But the USSR people's deputies discussed not only the candidacies of government members. The examination of candidate members of the USSR Supreme Court collegiums and the USSR Prosecutor's Office at a joint sitting of the Committee for Questions of Legislation, Legality, and Law and Order and the Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals lasted 2 days. Many pointed and impartial questions were put to A. Vasilyev who until recently was the Leningrad prosecutor and had now come before the deputies as candidate for the post of USSR first deputy general prosecutor and member of the USSR Prosecutor's Office collegium. A. Vasilyev headed the Leningrad prosecutor's office at a particularly crucial period when restructuring was beginning and the process of democratization was encountering opposition from some local leaders who had become accustomed only to ruling and giving commands. During young people's actions against the demolition of the former "Angleterre" hotel, the city prosecutor's office ignored officials' incompetent actions.

The sitting also cited the example of how the Leningrad prosecutor's office "hushed up" the investigation of the case of the misappropriation of valuable artistic treasures from the well known Ashik collection. Other instances were mentioned... As a result A. Vasilyev's candidacy did not receive the support of the people's deputies.

S. Gusev, candidate member of the USSR Supreme Court collegium and candidate first deputy chairmen of the USSR Supreme Court, also failed to get the necessary number of votes. The committees also failed to recommend R. Tikhomirnov and A. Filatov as candidate deputy chairmen of the USSR Supreme Court.

It is still too early to say how the coming USSR Supreme Soviet session will assess all the past and future recommendations. But one thing is already clear now that the commissions and committees have been working for several days: The "exams" which we have described are not easy and will not get easier in the future. This difficulty is due to the complexity and scale of the coming changes.

Committees, Commissions Vote on Candidates

PM2806105389 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 26 Jun 89 Morning Edition pp 1-2

[Special correspondents A. Davydov, V. Dolganov, and A. Stepovoy report under the rubric "At the USSR Supreme Soviet Committees and Commissions": "Main Priority"]

[Excerpts] The USSR Supreme Soviet session is resuming after a recess for sittings of chamber committees and commissions. From sitting to sitting over the past few days there has been a growing desire on the part of deputies to investigate in depth the problems of developing the country's national economy and to find ways of overcoming backwardness, imbalances, and all kinds of shortages. New approaches to restructuring were thrown up by the discussions between deputies and candidate ministers, and sectors' short- and long-term tasks were discussed. Funds were found for new production programs and comprehensive systems. Scientific and industrial priorities were defined.

And throughout the entire week, at each individual or joint sitting of commissions and committees one topic was invariably developed and deepened: the value of the individual as the center of restructuring processes. For too long we were "cogs" and "gears" in the state machine. Too often our economy functioned for the sake of the economy, funds and capacities were accumulated for the sake of amalgamating them and building them up to a gigantic and absurd scale. Was any thought given to people?

The new approach is determined by the priority of people in the system of all other values. Each candidate for the post of deputy and first deputy chairman of the Council of Ministers and the contenders for ministerial positions has had to answer the deputies' highly difficult, pointed, and sometimes even tricky questions on economic, social, and legal problems and the protection of the individual. How can we ensure the unswerving fulfillment of social programs at a time of acute shortages? How does a potential minister view the possibility of removing millions of our countrymen from the poverty line? How can we not only ensure a minimum living wage, but also give some of the most needy—invalids, the elderly, and orphans—an opportunity to satisfy many normal human needs?

Things were particularly hard for the youngest candidate minister—the 40-year-old V. Shcherbakov, a contender for the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee for Labor and Social Problems. This is understandable. We have no sector that is neglected more. V. Shcherbakov's opponents were people wise with experience of life—members of the Soviet of the Union Committee for Veteran and Invalid Affairs and the Commission for Labor, Price, and Social Policy Questions. [passage omitted]

Few people had to take such a severe examination. But in the end the veterans thanked the candidate for the ministerial post for his program, accompanying it with the nowadays untypical—I say that without the slightest irony—prolonged applause. Nobody voted against, nobody abstained.

A joint sitting of the Committee for Defense and State Security Questions and the Commission for Transportation, Communications, and Information Science Questions examined the candidacy of I. Koksanov, who in the previous government headed the shipbuilding sector, for the post of USSR minister of the shipbuilding industry. The contender reported that the new program for the ministry's activity envisaged switching such giants as the "Baltiyskiy Zavod" Association in Leningrad, the "Leninskaya Kuznitsa" Production Association in Kiev, and a number of other enterprises to exclusively civilian production.

Deputies asked many questions about the problems of saturating the market with prime necessities and about the problems of interdepartmental production sharing to meet the demand for goods in short supply as quickly as possible. Many speeches showed that in a number of cases there is no such production sharing, for which the ministry headed by I. Koksanov was to blame to a considerable extent. For instance, the sector had demonstrated initiative in developing and creating new high-speed "Cyclone" hydrofoils designed to serve vacation areas. However, the leaders of the Ministry of the Maritime Fleet have not operated the "Cyclones" for departmental reasons.

I. Koksanov restricted himself to criticizing his "neighbors." This is a well-known situation, isn't it? Departments cannot find common ground, and the consumer suffers. Are operational managers unhappy about some qualities of the new equipment? Is further work required? People can have businesslike negotiations by all means, they can argue by all means, but they must solve the problem. Deputies made clear the need for such an approach to I. Koksanov, who was recommended for the post of minister by a majority vote.

The program of N. Konarev, a contender for the post of USSR minister of railways, was discussed for several hours. [passage omitted] The deputies supported N. Konarev's candidacy by a majority vote after expressing criticism.

The examination of candidate members of the USSR Prosecutor's Office Collegium ended on the third day of the joint sitting of the Committee for Legislative, Legal, and Law and Order Questions and the Committee for Questions of Glasnost and Citizens' Rights and Appeals. S. Yemelyanov, V. Ilyukhin, I. Karpets, G. Smirnov, Yu. Shadrin, A. Shkrebets, and Yu. Khitrin had to undergo a difficult examination before their candidacies were recommended for ratification at the Supreme Soviet session.

"How did you manage to become rector of Yakut law school at the age of 22?"

"Will payment for citizens' registration be introduced everywhere and how constitutional is this?

"How do you intend to struggle against the arbitrariness of our people's judges?

These and dozens of other questions were answered that day by 57-year-old Doctor of Juridical Sciences Professor V. Yakovlev, director of the All-Union Scientific Research Institute for Soviet State Building and Legislation, who was recommended as a candidate for the post of USSR minister of justice. The decision on the recommendation was unanimous: The contender had demonstrated both the desire and the ability to struggle for full legal protection for the Soviet people.

Competence and a modern vision of ecological problems and ways of solving them were demonstrated by Academician A. Isayev, who was recommended for the post of chairman of the USSR State Committee for Forestry by the members of the Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources.

Despite severe criticism, N. Kotlyar was recommended for appointment as USSR minister of the fish industry.

The discussion on the candidacy of P. Polad-Zade—who, as we have already reported, was not recommended for the post of USSR minister of land reclamation and water resources by a USSR Supreme Soviet committee—lasted several hours. At a joint sitting ecologist deputies again rejected this candidate, while agrarian deputies supported him. The deputies opted to vote by name in order to clarify the position of the Committee for Questions of Ecology and the Rational Use of Natural Resources. Twenty five of the 30 members attending voted against, with one abstention.

The Committee for Agrarian Questions and Food rejected the candidacy of V. Kalashnikov—a contender for the post of first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

The procedure for the discussion of L. Davletov, who was recommended for the post of chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee's Light Industry Committee and as a USSR minister passed off without any particular difficulty. Things were somewhat harder for K. Katushev, whom the deputies asked dozens of acute questions, but he too was recommended for the post of USSR minister of foreign economic relations.

So the hearings are over. And their main result is that the deputies have moved from their former mechanical voting in our parliament's committees and commissions to a detailed and in-depth elaboration of problems. To all intents and purposes, they have moved toward the creation and amendment of programs for the future activity of executive organs. Serious and intensive work was done and will be completed by the USSR Supreme Soviet session. And, although it is too early to demand direct and specific results from it, a good start has been made.

Draft Ecological Program Presented to Committees
LD2606151389 Moscow TASS in English 1449 GMT 26 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 26 TASS—The draft state ecological programme was read out here at a joint meeting of the Supreme Soviet committee for ecological matters and rational use of natural resources and the USSR State Committee for the Protection of Nature (Goskompriroda).

Summing up the main provisions of the draft programme, Petr Poletayev, first deputy chairman of the USSR Goskompriroda, said that the state programme of environmental protection and rational use of natural resources for the 13th five-year period (1991-1995) and up to the year 2005 will require over 400 billion roubles, including over 130 billion roubles for capital investments into nature conservation measures. This is almost four times as much as was allocated for these purposes during the whole of the last 15 years.

Poletayev said the main purpose of the programme is to lessen discharges of pollutants into the environment and considerably improve the use of natural resources. By the year 2000 it is planned to stop the discharge of effluent in all the water basins of the USSR. The discharge of pollutants into the atmosphere is to decrease by half by the year 2005. First of all it is planned to take nature conservation measures in areas with an unsatisfactory ecological situation, in large industrial centres and in resorts.

Local government bodies will be entrusted with planning and controlling nature conservation measures, Poletayev said. As of 1991, plants will be fined for polluting the environment, with the amount of the fine increasing to match the level of pollution. The increases will be made in such a way that it will be economically advantageous for enterprises to implement nature conservation measures. The programme also envisages the introducton of payments for natural resources. The figure will also increase on violations of the ecological balance.

Eighty-five per cent of the funds will be redirected to the ecological funds of local Soviets, while 15 per cent will go to republican and union funds for the protection of nature, to be spent on measures of nature conservation.

Soviet of the Union Chairman Primakov Interviewed
18001267 Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian 21 Jun 89 p 10

[Interview with Academician Yevgeniy Maksimovich Primakov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Soviet of the Union, by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA political commentator Igor Belyayev: "The Congress Made It Possible for Our People To Comprehend Themselves Better"; date, place of interview not given]

[Text] [Belyayev] I would like to begin with a logical question that nonetheless seems banal: What are your general and personal impressions of the past First Congress of People's Deputies?

[Primakov] If you will, the congress was a reflection of our society. It revealed various cross-sections of it—national, social, and political ones. I believe that the congress made it possible for our people to comprehend themselves better, and for the leading organs to visualize in more depth what our society amounts to.

If we are to talk about conclusions, it seems to me that the main point is that our entire society is now in favor of restructuring, and the congress reflected it. It could be that deputies were present at the congress who are against restructuring deep down. I do not know, but there may have been such people. However, it is very characteristic that nobody mounted the podium with anti-restructuring pronouncements. This is an indication of the fact that the overwhelming bulk of the population of our country supports restructuring. Apparently, a handful are against it, failing to understand that the command-administrative model has already led us into a crisis and into a blind alley. We cannot go on like that.

[Belyayev] However, at the congress many other points of view and considerations were stated. This is where I see the very surprise which the question touched on.

[Primakov] Yes, different opinions and views were stated at the congress. The plurality of opinions which we very recently discussed in the abstract was graphically present at the congress. However, this plurality of opinions did not revolve around the issue of whether restructuring is to be or not to be. No, the difference of opinions at the congress was expressed in approaches to the issue of the pace at which it must be carried out, and how radical and resolute the actions should be. This is where the plurality of opinions was expressed.

If we were to carry on about general impressions, it was liberation. We often say that restructuring has not accomplished the desirable in the economy. Indeed, numerous shortages and the disequilibrium in the financial system are the indications of our failure to achieve very much of what we wanted to achieve in the economy. Moreover, it is absolutely obvious that the situation that has emerged cannot be explained only by the grave heritage of the past. At the congress, the stress was laid on mistakes made already in the period of restructuring, on unsolved problems that involve us rather than our predecessors, and quite rightly so. As I see it, it was proper. However, if someone is going to deny that restructuring has already acomplished a lot, I believe the congress itself refutes this conclusion. Which one of us could have thought 4 years ago, or even as recently as a year ago, that such a congress was at all possible?

[Belyayev] I believe, Yevgeniy Maksimovich, that we would be justified in talking about a breakthrough. Indeed, about a breakthrough which very recently we only dreamt about. Old notions about how grand meetings, congresses, and sessions of the Supreme Soviet of this kind must be held are a matter of the past. In this sense, the congress has set a historical precedent. I believe that the broad spectrum, or range, of the views of those who took the floor, who made their opinions known at this congress in some way speaks in favor of this conclusion. It is a pity, however, that procedures for its operation were not clearly set forth at the very first meeting.

[Primakov] The Congress of People's Deputies showed political functionaries of a new generation. Let us recall the kind of statements made at the congress—very serious, and many of them, I would like to stress, based on the genuine knowledge of life, statements cleansed of the desire to be liked by someone on high. I consider it to be a great credit to the congress that it showed how quickly individuals are ascending from the depth of the people who were previously kept down by the power of the apparatus. By now these competent, knowledgeable, and professional people have demonstrated their ability to lead the country.

[Belyayev] All in all, what was the most important, I would say definitive, thing at the congress; what laid the foundation for the results of its work?

[Primakov] The tremendous significance of the congress in our life is determined by the fact that it brought us to the line beyond which genuine power of the people begins. It seems to me that this is the most important thing. Look at the documents of the congress, at its resolution that will be published in a few days. It says in a straightforward manner that the congress is assuming the entirety of power. This is the Leninist interpretation of the issue—which follows from the essence of socialism, resolutions of the 27th CPSU Congress, and the 19th All-Union CPSU Conference—which proclaimed the need to separate the functions of party leadership from the functions of state leadership, the functions of executive power that is directly involved in economic practices, while preserving the leading role of the party... By now we have already embarked on that. It seems to me that this is the main significance of the congress.

[Belyayev] In your opinion, if we look back at the 13 days of the work of the congress that fascinated the entire country—what was the general nature of the discussion?

[Primakov] I believe that the discussion at the congress may be clearly divided into two parts. The first is strategic restructuring problems. As I see it, differing interpretations were the fewest here, and the least number of differences in views was stated. An overwhelming majority of those speaking believed that we should proceed toward a self-developing economy, give up excessive centralization, while, of course, retaining certain levers in the hands of the state. After all, as you know, regulation exists in capitalist countries as well, and in different forms at that, and it is administered from the center. The general concept of the discussion was also expressed in the conclusions of its participants on the need to genuinely reinforce the economic sovereignty of union republics, and on the need to resolve the nationality issue with a maximum of discretion, taking into account the interests of not only the union republics, but also of the autonomous entities, of all minor nations and nationalities.

The greatest range of opinions became apparent on the issues of tactics, present-day issues. I would say that some statements were worded quietly. For example, this was the case with the report by N. Ryzhkov. It referred to the need for balanced measures in bringing the economy out of the crisis condition. Other deputies, hitting the critical note, demanded radical actions in the economic sphere. Demands for extraordinary, emergency measures were also heard, demands that were supported by a considerable segment of the deputies. In this regard, for example, we can note the statements by G. Popov, N. Shmelev, and P. Bunich.

I would also like to note the following: The perception that the critical condition in the economy cannot be ameliorated by returning to the administrative-command methods of managing the economy was characteristic of both the former and the latter. Certainly, emergency measures always envisage arbitrary, administrative solutions of some kind, and not only economic ones. However, at the same time the dialectic of events is such that these devices should ultimately serve the abandonment of administrative-command devices of economic operations, should serve restructuring. This is a paradox that exists and that should be resolved by life. If we are going to take the path of command-administrative methods to overcome the difficult economic situation in our country, we are going to lose. We will lose restructuring. This is why a solution is found only on the path of continuing restructuring. I believe that the understanding of this was common for different statements.

[Belyayev] In your opinion, with reference to what you have already said, have new forms been found for the emergence of parliamentary culture in the Soviet Union? Have fitting forms of expounding problems and raising issues been found in order to invite the attention of all to the need for and urgency of them without high-flown rhetoric, but on the merit of them?

[Primakov] If we refer to parliamentary culture, we are still in the beginning of its emergence, at the starting point of the path. After all, the old USSR Supreme Soviet acted "in a cultured manner"—if that is what we can call raising your hands and voting unanimously on all issues. There were not any departures from "culture" there. Now we have encountered an entirely different state of affairs and a different Supreme Soviet, a different national parliament. Here we have to work out absolutely new norms of operation and behavior, not only procedures, but also the ethical norms by which the delegates are to be guided. Let me give this example: U.S. Congressmen, both senators and members of the House of Representatives who enjoy legislative initiative, submit their bills only at appointed hours. A congressman cannot just rush up to the microphone and state his initiative, and all the more so when the chairman (speaker of the chamber) does not give him the floor. Something of that nature is out of the question. We should consider this. In many parliaments, procedures exist according to which the discussion is strictly limited by a certain time frame that cannot be exceeded. We should also consider this. In many parliaments a rule exists according to which the right to a follow-up speech is only given after all deputies who wish to speak have done so.

I sat there at the end of the row, and those who definitely wanted to speak or ask a question at the microphone came past me. So one comrade tried to make his way to the podium very zealously and frequently; for some reason, they would not give him the floor. Then he again demanded to be allowed to speak for all kinds of reasons. In response to my question concerning the cause of such hyperactivity, he said: "I have not spoken once yet."

That's it! There also were deputies who started their speeches with the words "Respected comrades voters!" Only after that they addressed the deputies of the congress. I do not want to criticize them for it. I would like you to get me right. I am in favor of direct communication between deputies and their electorate. At the same time, we need to clearly visualize that a deputy speaks before the congress rather than the TV. Our glasnost should be complete. We should broadcast to the entire country and the entire world the congresses we hold and the sessions of the USSR Supreme Soviet. However, parliamentary culture will apparently emerge in our country gradually. One of the manifestations of it is that the deputy thinks not only about his popularity with the voters and getting them to like him, but mostly about ways to solve the extraordinary issues that cannot be delayed and which our society is now facing.

In many foreign parliaments the focal point of preparing bills is shifted to committees and commissions. This determines the nature of discussion in the chambers if the question has been duly worked on in the relevant committee or commission, naturally, with experts invited, with many hearings, with materials requested

from state organizations, and so forth. Some of these committee hearings are held behind closed doors, which in our country some people do not want to understand.

[Belyayev] Yevgeniy Maksimovich, now I would like our conversation to shift to a slightly different area. I have known you for a very long time. Now that you have assumed this new post I am entitled to ask you this question. How do you feel in this post? How do you imagine your work in this high position, which will give you an opportunity to influence in the most direct manner a genuine transfer of power in our country to the control of the soviets?

[Primakov] It would be incorrect to say that I feel absolutely confident in my new capacity, and absolutely prepared for such a job. In any case, I will not do anything rash without striving to duly learn a lot of what I am not aware of. The change in my life is too abrupt. I have been primarily involved in research work, though I have on occasion managed large collectives.

I have to learn a lot here. I am not ashamed of this; I consider this normal and necessary.

If we are to talk about the new role of the chamber, the new role of the USSR Supreme Soviet, we should indeed spare no effort for the Supreme Soviet to become a truly most significant segment of the system of people's power. This can only be done if we indeed transfer legislative functions to the Supreme Soviet. I am talking first about law creation activities, and second about creating a mechanism for passing amendments to the laws already in effect. If we want to create a rule-of-law state we should obey the laws for as long as they are in effect. We should not start a reshuffle of the laws. At the same time, the laws coming in contact with life bring to light some of their segments that are no longer appropriate for the present day. This happens frequently. This is where the system of amendments to the laws should work, which will make it possible to perfect an existing law without abolishing it.

[Belyayev] This is very important because, after all, at present we have some kind of desire to repeal or revise some laws. It seems to me that the system of amendments you have mentioned will make it possible to continuously improve the entire legislative system of our country without repealing the laws in effect.

[Primakov] The second main function will certainly be to oversee the executive power. We should once and for all put an end to the lack of control that has frequently brought about dangerous willfulness. We should once and for all ensure the supervision of activities of all ministries without exception. This supervision may and should be performed first through the most serious discussion of the budget. In our country, obviously, one of the sessions of the Supreme Soviet is going to be "budgetary," devoted mostly to the consideration of the state budget—discussion in the chambers with the return referral of individual issues to commissions and committees of the Supreme Soviet, and again discussion in the chambers.

Certainly, all major bills, all without exception, should go through the pertinent commissions and committees of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Belyayev] Only the ones involving our country's internal affairs?

[Primakov] Our external affairs in particular. We should rule out the practice whereby decisions were made in private, even of such a magnitude as the sending of troops to Afghanistan. All issues associated with the use of our Armed Forces beyond the borders of the USSR, major loans given to foreign states, aid to foreign states—all of that should go through the USSR Supreme Soviet. Ratifying treaties with foreign countries is also a matter for the Supreme Soviet, and not a formal ratification, but with a preceding serious discussion.

One more point that is also very significant—inviting representatives of the executive apparatus to the committees and commissions in order to respond to questions...

[Belyayev] How do you intend to handle inquiries by deputies?

[Primakov] It is necessary to respond to all inquiries. Absolutely! However, I would like to clarify one point in this matter: The surge of people's power, the transfer to the control of soviets of an increasing number of functions were based on the separation of executive functions from legislative ones. However, as I see it, at present another dangerous trend might also emerge—and this was clear from some statements at the congress—when some people believe that we almost should endow the Supreme Soviet with executive functions of some kind.

We need a clear-cut boundary between the legislative and executive authorities. For example, when the draft resolution of the congress was being prepared (an editorial commission headed by Vadim Andreyevich Medvedev, of which I also was a member, was at work) there were also suggestions of this nature: State in the document that it is necessary to increase retirement benefits by a given amount, and introduce this or that beginning on a given date. They forgot that we cannot act in the stead of an executive organ. We may and should provide general direction for the operations of the executive organ, and review how the assignment is being carried out. However, we cannot make decisions that [belong] to the Ministry of Finance and the Gosplan [State Planning Committee].

[Belyayev] Yes, this is very essential indeed. It is all the more so because our public, which followed very closely the work of the congress and will follow the work of the

USSR Supreme Soviet—I am convinced of that—was getting the impression that at the time all power was being transferred to the control of the congress, and all deputies enjoy the legislative and executive right. As some of our fellow citizens imagine, in this manner problems that have accumulated in all recent years can be rapidly solved. Now I would like to ask a question that is of interest to all—a question about mutual relations between the Soviet of the Union with the supreme soviets of union republics. After all, such mutual relations are definitely going to exist, since the functions are similar—legislative in both instances. How do you imagine these mutual relations; how are they going to develop?

[Primakov] I believe that republic Supreme Soviets are absolutely independent organs of power which, in general, resolve various issues falling within their jurisdiction, within the framework of the USSR Constitution in effect. I do not think that we or any other organ should direct them. Close relations, exchange of opinions, consultations, discussions—all of this is obviously useful and necessary.

[Belyayev] I agree—and on a broad range of issues at that.

[Primakov] Certainly, on a broad range of issues. One of these issues is the substantive part of the economic sovereignty of republics. We should discuss and even argue about many issues. It is necessary to abandon the distortions that existed in the period of Stalin and the period of stagnation. These distortions of the relations between the center and the republics must be eliminated. At the same time, we certainly need to do everything in order for our national economy as a whole not to suffer. I believe that not only those who live in the center or work in the center are interested in it, but also the republics themselves.

[Belyayev] I just happened to hear the statement by President G. Bush to the effect that the United States will support the trends of a centrifugal nature that, according to him, exist in the Baltic republics. The U.S. Congress passed a special declaration on this topic. I believe that these statements have been made for the purpose of urging on the extremist elements there. In your opinion, does this position of the United States conform to the new and positive [trend] emerging in Soviet-American relations?

[Primakov] Certainly, I am not inclined to deny that in the United States not only individual persons, but perhaps even some institutions exist that are guided by the principle: The worse it is for us, the better it is for them. However, I do not think that President G. Bush and his administration are interested in restructuring being slowed down abruptly at present. I do not believe that other realistically thinking American functionaries are interested in this either.

[Belyayev] One more current question. It involves the issues of Afghanistan. Different statements were heard at the congress concerning them. In addition, recently the newspaper PRAVDA carried a message from the National Council (parliament) of the Republic of Afghanistan directly to the USSR Supreme Soviet. The attitude of Kabul, of the Afghan legislators to what happened in our country, here, in Moscow, is stated in it, and the readers know about it. What is the position of the Supreme Soviet on that?

[Primakov] Naturally, I cannot speak for the USSR Supreme Soviet. I can tell you my personal perception. A retrospective evaluation of what has happened in Afghanistan is one aspect of the matter. Certainly, we should have done a more complete analysis of the entire range of political alternatives before making a decision on sending our troops to this country, and certainly this issue should have been duly discussed, with the specialists invited. For example, as follows from an interview with the USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs E. Shevardnadze to one of the newspapers, not even the entire political leadership of the country knew about the decision made on sending troops. I think that [the complexity of] the internal situation in Afghanistan was seriously underestimated. After all, the Afghan leadership came to the conclusion on creating a coalition government and national reconciliation as late as the ninth year of our troops' stay there. I believe that it is difficult to talk about a revolutionary situation in Afghanistan at the time the troops were sent, despite the events of April 1978 definitely having been a tremendous step forward and foreshadowing serious changes of a progressive nature. However, on the other hand, I would by no means set this conclusion against those on the ill-intentioned actions of external forces directed, among other things, against us in Afghanistan. For example, I consider it to be, mildly speaking, incorrect when we simply beat our breast, and at the same time do not want to state objectively what the United States has done there, and what certain American circles continue to do there, what Pakistan has done, and how reactionary elements in the Arab countries behave with regard to Afghanistan. We need an objective picture in its entirety.

Look, it was believed that Najibullah and his government would not last a month. They openly said it it in Washington. American political scientists told me that while I was still the director of the Institute for World Economics and International Relations. Very many people argued with us and contended that the government does not represent anyone, and that it would collapse after our troops withdraw. It turned out to be absolutely not so. An offensive against Jalalabad, carried out with direct Pakistani participation, did not result in success by the armed Afghan opposition, which is against the current authorities in Kabul. I believe that the Americans and Pakistanis, and the mujahidin supported by them are making a serious mistake when they think that a coalition government may be created without those

who are now in power in Kabul. In this matter, all responsibility devolves on the forces which aid the mujahidin and reinforce their implacability with the aid.

[Belyayev] In conjunction with the issue of Afghanistan being raised at the congress, which facets of the problem were still not taken into account?

[Primakov] I would make two observations concerning this. First, all those taking the floor should proceed from genuinely objective information rather than rumors of some kind. This is the first point. Second, I must say that, as it seems, a critical evaluation retrospectively turned to the past should by no means have anything to do with even an indirect denunciation of the actions of our children-soldiers who were there with our army. They performed their duty as soldiers; they behaved heroically over there. Many of them paid with their lives, and we should bow our heads in their memory. Many of them are crippled, and your heart bleeds when you see disabled young people. We need more reason and less emotion in judgments on Afghanistan.

[Belyayev] Your opinion on everything associated with the events in Fergana and other cities and rayons of Uzbekistan?

[Primakov] I would like to say that what has happened in Uzbekistan is not natural, despite following from the mistakes made in the past. Nationalism and the criminal element dominated there, and an end should be put to it with the fullest severity of the law.

[Belyayev] Finally, an event has occurred as important as the first visit of Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev to the FRG, already in his capacity as the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I would like to hear not just your opinion on this event, since much has been said already, but on its very essence.

[Primakov] You know that a proper perspective is needed. Still more time needs to elapse in order to grasp everything. What was done during the visit is a tremendous breakthrough. I very much count on a large pick-up in economic cooperation in bilateral relations with the FRG. We simply need this. I believe that this is very advantageous for the FRG. On the other hand, it definitely stabilizes the situation on the European Continent. As is known, on an entire array of issues the FRG now holds a more realistic position than some of its NATO partners. The position of the FRG is very important from the standpoint of advancing the [process of] bringing the positions of NATO and the Warsaw Pact closer together. Sincere talks between Mikhail Sergeyevich and Helmut Kohl will serve to bring closer together the positions of the two blocs on the issues of arms reductions. Finally, I would like to stress that, especially in the post-restructuring period, in establishing and developing relations with other countries we have not sought to tear them away from someone, or turn them against somebody, or play them as a card against third states. This, I believe, also fosters general normalization of the world political situation.

[Belyayev] Thank you very much. LITERATURNAYA GAZETA congratulates you on your election to the post of chairman of the Soviet of the Union, and wishes you much success in this important work.

Gorbachev Thanks Leaders for Congratulations

LD2706224589 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1451 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jun (TASS)—Mikhail Gorbachev expressed heartfelt gratitude for the greetings and congratulations which were sent to him in connection with his election to the post of USSR Supreme Soviet chairman. The telegram, which was published here today, says:

"My heartfelt thanks for the greetings and congratulations which have been sent to me in connection with my election to the post of USSR Supreme Soviet chairman.

"I regard the greetings of the Soviet people as an expression of their firm confidence in the correctness of the path of restructuring, which we have chosen, and which leads to genuine power of the people, to the maximum possible implementation of the social, economic, and intellectual potential of socialism. In these greetings I can see enormous trust in party policy, and in the policy of deepening the revolutionary transformations and fundamental renewal of our society, which was approved by the USSR Congress of People's Deputies.

"I would like to express sincere gratitude to the heads of states and governments, political and public figures, representatives of science and culture, and the citizens of foreign countries who congratulated me on my election to the highest state post."

Chebrikov Meets With Civil Aviation Workers

LD2706221289 Moscow TASS in English 2041 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—Viktor Chebrikov, Politburo member and secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee and parliamentary deputy, met workers of the USSR Ministry of Civil Aviation Tuesday. This was one of a series of meetings held by Communist Party leaders after the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, at which they exchange views with working people on topical problems.

Addressing the meeting, Chebrikov said that material well-being, spiritual development and moral health of society and each of its members are the supreme goal of the party's activities. "The party has honestly admitted mistakes of the past, initiated the perestroika drive and led efforts to renovate society," he said.

"It is dissatisfied with the pace of perestroika, the economic situation, lack of day-to-day goods, and other shortcomings. But this dissatisfaction is constructive, active, and giving impetus to more thought-out and goal-oriented efforts. "But still, despite all this, various reproaches are being flung at the party. Of course, some of the criticism is justified but, regrettably, there are quite groundless attacks," Chebrikov pointed out.

He said a number of "apparently anti-socialist groups" are now actively kindling social discontent and trying to set the working class, young people, scientists and the creative intelligentsia against the party. "Many working people demand that strict measures be taken against demagogues and instigators who are trying by any means to discredit the party and the ideas of perestroika and who commit extremist actions," the Central Committee secretary went on. "They think that such actions should be countered not only with arguments of reason and conviction but also with the force of Soviet laws. And this is fair.

"After the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, one could often hear calls like this: 'They won't give us the power of their own free will, so let's take it by force'. How should this be understood? If the meaning is that the power should be given to those who don't like socialism, to those who long for monarchy, who take to Pushkin Square under the flag of the Russian empire, then, indeed, neither the people nor the party will give them the power," Chebrikov said.

"Any unbiased person will see that there is no other force in our society but the Communist Party that can lead it out of the crisis. It is the party and its programme of perestroika, democratisation and glasnost that have stirred society and given a chance to renovation.

"It is the party that is the most powerful guarantor of perestroika's irreversibility and that does not let itself be distracted onto the path of light promises, extremes and forestalling events. The party is pursuing an energetic and, at the same time, balanced and realistic policy," Chebrikov said.

Urges Workers To Defend Party Line

LD2706223289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1700 GMT 27 Jun 89

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Comrade Chebrikov familiarized himself today with the work of certain civil aviation enterprises.

[Correspondent L. Elin, identified by screen caption] pilots of the central administration of international air communications fly to 119 towns and 97 countries of the world and to the north and to the south of the country. [video shows lengthy views of airport runways, Aeroflot planes on the ground and in the air]

The yearly profit from the work of the central administration of international air communications is about 30 percent of all civil aviation. Until quite recently these figures were a comfort to one's ears, but today it is clear that the pool of modern planes is too small—planes such as the IL-86, the YAK-42, the IL-62M, the TU-154M, and the fuel economy of most machines is inferior to similar foreign planes.

The development of transportation is outstripping the possibilities of the material and technical base at Sheremetyevo airport, and this is our best airport. Last year alone Aeroflot refused tickets to 15 million passengers, including on international routes. [video shows scenes in airport waiting rooms]

Viktor Mikhaylovich Chebrikov and leaders of the sector spoke about this during their meeting. Attention was paid to the importance of timely and qualitative training of new generations of aviators. The CPSU Central Committee secretary familiarized himself with the work of the teaching and training center. [video shows Chebrikov and others seated and listening to a man in blue uniform; camera cuts to show Aeroflot official, plus entourage, looking at training equipment; observing pilots in training and in a classroom]

Here, on training equipment, pilots work through the most complex situations which can be encountered in flight, and retrain to pilot new aircraft. Incidentally, the professional skill of our crews is very highly appraised in the world.

Then Viktor Mikhaylovich Chebrikov had a look around Sheremetyevo-1 Airport, and talked to the airport building employees. He drew attention to the need to improve the work conditions in all of its services, especially those where women are employed. [video shows Chebrikov, others inspecting airport and talking to female employees] The technical aviation complex and the technical radio facility undoubtedly—and this was stressed in the conversation—need modernization. There is a shortage of hangars for repairing large and medium-sized planes and of those that there are, the equipment is in many respects out of date. Aircraft often stand idle for long periods of time on the ground because of the lack of aviation engines. Cadre employees at this complex talked about all of this to the CPSU Central Committee secretary in a frank conversation. [video shows Chebrikov and entourage walking outdoors; inside a hangar looking at an IL-86, listening to employees talking]

Comrade chebrikov also observed the work of air traffic controllers at Sheremetyevo Airport. [video shows chebrikov and others inside a control tower]

Today he delivered a speech to the Aeroflot party and economic aktiv. Talking about the role of the party today, Viktor Mikhaylovich Chebrikov said, in particular: [video shows close-ups of Chebrikov speaking at the meeting; views of the people in attendance in the hall]

[Begin Chebrikov recording] Any unprejudiced thinking person cannot but see that in our society, apart from the Communist Party, there is no force capable of taking it out of this crisis. The CPSU has revealed problems which have come to a head and defined the reasons for them and ways to solve them. It is the party and its program of restructuring, democratization, and glasnost which have roused society and provided a chance for renewal. It is the party which is the most powerful guarantor for the irreversibility of restructuring, and which does not allow itself to be drawn on to the road of superficial promises, of going from one extreme to another and running too far ahead. It is conducting an energetic and at the same time considered and realistic policy. Of course, there are errors also but not in the main thing, not in the strategy, not in the general course.

Therefore, the party is always ready to accept justified and constructive criticism, practical remarks, and suggestions. However, it is impossible to be reconciled with attacks on the party and its cadres, with unfounded accusations levelled at the party apparatus. Such attacks on the party are tantamount to blows at restructuring, at its present and future. The times demand active actions to protect restructuring, to defend the party line, both in word and deed. [end recording]

[Elin] The CPSU Central Committee secretary also stressed the need for qualitative changes to the work of Aeroflot, and answered many questions.

Yakovlev Addresses Social Sciences Institute

LD2706211889 Moscow TASS in English 2057 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—The establishment of people's power, democratisation of socialist society is the essence of perestroika, said Aleksandr Yakovlev, member of the Politburo and secretary of the Central Committee of the Soviet Communist Party. He spoke on Tuesday in the Social Sciences Institute at the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee at a meeting to mark the graduation of another batch of students—representatives of communist, workers and revolutionary-democratic parties.

Dwelling on the experience of four years of perestroika, Yakovlev emphasised that the analysis of the state of society unprecedented for depth, openness and sincerity has been made. That analysis was painful and took courage. It was dominated by criticism, which is understandable, Yakovlev said. The criticism was so acute that it frightened certain persons in the USSR, and some friends abroad. This criticism was a sort of compensation for many decades of silence and glorification. Criticism has become simultaneously a boon, salvation and punishment.

But with taking into account the accumulated social experience and all the consequences of the purifying wave it would be justifiable to ask if we have not lingered too long at this stage. Isn't it that new inertia has emerged—to call in question everything, to heighten, willingly or unwillingly, social pessimism which is only to advantage of the anti-perestroika forces?

Apparently there is a danger of a sort of social masochism when it does not matter on what to speculate: on glorification or disparagement. A moral barrier should be placed to this undiscriminating attitude, the speaker said. It is the improvement of the social situation, democracy, development of a rational attitude, patriotic concern over errors and failures, the inclination to work, to create, rather than talk.

Noting that there is nothing insurmountable in problems with which perestroika deals, Yakovlev said that this confidence is based not only on a realistic, sound appraisal of the country's internal reserves and possibilities, but also on relationship between socialism and the processes of world development, between perestroika and international life.

People's Congress Promotes Rule-of-Law State

PM2706090589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 14 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 1

[Article by Yuriy Feofanov: "The Congress and the Rule-of-Law State"]

[Text] Someone—one of our economic managers or one of their businessmen—said: The mechanics of the job are the job. Procedures and regulations perform the role of the "mechanics of the job" in establishing the principles of the rule of law, law and order, and democracy.

As a matter of fact, the rule-of-law state or the legal setup in the state is above all legal mechanisms: procedural norms and procedures. In itself a law or, rather, a normative act, is only a declaration, a slogan, a promise. As N.V. Gogol wrote: "A decree, no matter how well-conceived and definitive it might be, is no more than a blank sheet of paper, unless there is the same honest desire from below to apply it in the proper way..." Procedures and regulations, that is, mechanisms, only then can give the law life, effectiveness, and power.

Consider our 1936 and 1977 Constitutions. They are splendid on rights and freedoms. How enthusiastic we were when we wrote about the 1977 Constitution giving citizens the right to complain to the court about illegal actions by officials. In 10 years not one court accepted any constitutional actions by citizens: The appropriate mechanism did not exist. It was in 1987 that the law was adopted, although it was such that a citizen still had resort to the protection of the law. But for 10 years the constitutional norm was just a pretty slogan.

In essence, throughout the history of our state and its legal system, legal procedures and regulations have been replaced by instructions and clarifications: governmental, judicial, departmental. And issued by the party, what

is more, although it would be more accurate to say by the party apparatus. The supreme law was the "joint resolution," which is essentially not a law but, shall we say, a semilaw. But it was more authoritative than any law. So we ask ourselves: Has anyone ever questioned whether "join resolutions" are lawful, their juridical force, the mechanism whereby they are adopted and applied? No, such "formalities" have never excited us much.

This nihilistic legacy vis-a-vis regulations and procedures was apparent in the very first days of the Congress of People's Deputies. How does one elect the head of state: immediately or after his report? How do you form a Supreme Soviet when the candidates are virtual strangers as far as the people's deputies are concerned? A deputy made remarks to Soviet of the Union Chairman Ye.M. Primakov: His rejoinders and summaries are ill-judged, he should just give people the floor and observe the regulations—but where are the chairman's powers recorded, and by whom are they established?

There are any number of examples like this. And how each specific conflict, if it can be called a conflict, was resolved is not the point. It seems to me that the Congress proceedings were a model for the building of a rule-of-law state. We know—approximately, that is—what has to be done, but we are totally at a loss to answer the questions on how it should be done. Some deputies wanted to adopt fundmental decisions, even laws, there and then and obtain an immediate result. But it was realized at the Congress itself that there had been too many hurried decisions in the past and lawmaking brooks no haste. It is much harder altering than doing a thorough, quality job in the first place.

Current legislation is now the prerogative of the Supreme Soviet—the permanently operating parliament that has been set up for the first time in our state. Something like lack of confidence was expressed in it a priori. Whether the deputy was correct or incorrect, only practice will tell; there is simply no other way. One thing is certain: By electing USSR people's deputies, creating a Congress where everyone was able freely to express his opinion, and by forming a Supreme Soviet which is totally unlike its predecessor, we have laid the cornerstone for the rule-of-law state.

By the criteria of world state practice we are in a hurry. Too much of a hurry even. Authoritative lawyers have said that the bourgeois parliamentary states became rule-of-law states in the full sense of the phrase only after World War II (after World War I, some would say). If so, it took Britain 700 years to build its rule-of-law state and the United States and France 200 years. Here the very term "rule-of-law state" has been officially proclaimed during the restructuring period. As a doctrine it was enshrined in a 19th party conference resolution: "The conference deems it a matter of fundamental importance to form a socialist rule-of-law state as a manner of organizing political power that fully conforms to socialism."

That was just less than a year ago. And now we have the first practical steps... No, not hasty ones though. We cannot wait, because the reform of the political system is part and parcel of the economic transformations and the moral rebirth of society. It all forms a single, tight knot.

When we talk of a rule-of-law state it usually boils down to judicial and legal reform, the adoption of new laws, and the reorganization of the law-enforcement organs. The Congress and indeed the Supreme Soviet at its first sittings were unable to discuss these problems in detail, adopt laws, and so on. Therefore, legal reform and the building of a rule-of-law state were not discussed in detail in narrow juridical, law-enforcement terms. But the deputies did not ignore it.

For the first time in our experience the Supreme Soviet members discussed the top state officials before their appointment. We have only seen such things before on television, when it has shown sensational moments from the activities of parliamentarians abroad. I am not going to judge how light was shed on the personalities of the contenders, but what interested the Supreme Soviet members was their work qualities and action programs. It was this that governed the "cross-examination" of Ye.A. Smolentsev, chairman-elect of the USSR Supreme Court. He set out if not a full program then the main aspects of the upcoming legal reforms, and above all, the independence of the court and its proper status as the basic component of justice. Usually we associate this with trial by jury. Lawyers, and not only they, are vigorously discussing this matter at their conference and in the press. Sometimes this debate suggests: Introduce trial by jury and we have our rule-of-law state. The question that occurs to me is: Where do you accommodate the jury members in our squalid courtrooms? The Supreme Soviet has many priority problems, but I think the appalling state of court buildings is one of the most urgent. Despite the tight budget, something must be done about this. Incidentally, the way the court looks and the atmosphere in it are also educational factors that influence the struggle against crime. At the moment there is no way the accused, the witnesses, and the public are going to feel respect for the law when they cross the threshold of a court.

When answering questions prior to his appointment USSR General Prosecutor A.Ya. Sukharev expounded an action program for prosecutor's office oversight and for the state legal system as a whole. According to him, the prosecutors' sphere of action has narrowed. The fight against crime is indeed the number one task; the increasing number of offenses is worrying society. But prosecutor's office oversight no longer incorporates protection of citizens' rights against departments providing "services," criminal treatment of the environment, the causes of disasters, and the irresponsibility of both "switchman" and "stationmaster." But, I repeat, the building of a rule-of-law state is not just a matter of juridical reforms, important and urgent as they are. And not just a matter of legislation, although it is the basic

function of the new Soviet parliament. It appears that the activity of the parliamentary committees and chambers' commissions will largely determine the character of the country's supreme organs and, consequently, the character of the state itself.

During their formation there were many questions and suggestions about names and functions. As some deputies and, indeed, the chairman, M.S. Gorbachev noticed, there was an automatic tendency to assign things to different departmental pigeonholes, a tendency not to neglect any economic sector or sphere of life. A perfectly understandable tendency. But it is not the names, enumerating the functions, that will determine the style and character of committees' and commissions' activities—it is the activities themselves that do this. These parliamentary institutions can curb departments' monopolist and willful behavior and do the spadework when draft laws are in preparation. Then the public will at last get answers to as yet unanswered questions: Who created this legal act and who is to be held responsible, for example, for the defects? Indeed, there will be far fewer defects when there is an open and democratic discussion of draft laws and when all the essential parliamentary procedures are observed.

The work of the Congress and the first sittings of the Supreme Soviet produced the whole range of reactions: delight at the openness and boldness and disappointment—"but what real measures have been adopted?" Well, it is natural that there should be such a diversity of opinion. It is important that these opinions should exist, that people should not be indifferent toward what is taking place in the Kremlin. Indeed, the rule-of-law state is above all a democratic state in which there are as many opinions as there are people. An authoritarian power, presupposing unanimity and like-mindedness, cannot be a rule-of-law power; it can only use rule-of-law declarations to conceal its own essence.

We did not get this from a textbook. And it is this that generates the hope that there is simply no going back.

Interior Ministry Spokesman on Fergana Unrest

LD2706134389 Moscow TASS in English 1309 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—Law and order maintenance bodies are fully in control of the situation in Fergana Valley which was the scene of extremist-provoked large-scale ethnic unrest, Boris Mikhaylov, a spokesman for the USSR Interior Ministry, said at a news conference for Soviet and foreign journalists at the Ministry on Tuesday.

There are now 12,000 servicemen from among Interior Ministry troops in Fergana Valley, he said. Investigating groups consisting of the personnel of the State Security Committee, the procurator's office and the Interior Ministry of the USSR are inquiring into facts connected with the mass unrest.

Mikhaylov said that, as of today, criminal proceedings have been instituted in connection with 54 cases, 51 people have been arrested and 66 detained.

According to the data of the main criminal investigation department of the USSR Interior Ministry, specific circumstances and culprits are known in connection with 30 murders committed during the unrest. The confiscation and voluntary surrender of firearms by the population are being continued. According to the latest reports, 9,367 barrels have already been collected.

Mikhaylov pointed out that relations between Meskhetian Turks and the local population remained strained. More than 40,000 Turks had already left or continued leaving the area.

The situation in Guryev Region of Kazakhstan is much calmer. There is no mass unrest any longer but there are cases of rowdy behaviour, sometimes of a pronounced aggressive character, by teenagers.

In the city of Novyy Uzen, a teenager threw a homemade smoke bomb from the roof of a house at a militia patrol. There were no casualties. The situation is being controlled by interior agencies. Absenteeism at workplaces in Novyy Uzen is 1.7 per cent. Six units of firearms have been confiscated. The curfew remains in effect in the city.

Mikhaylov reported instances of the use of firearms by militia and interior troops. On June 4, he said, a mob of 4,000 besieged the building of the Interior Department in the town of Tashlak, Fergana Region. When the situation became threatening and negotiations with the rowdies proved to be of no avail, militia had to use firearms. Four extremists were mortally wounded, and another one was gunned down during an attack on a militia patrol.

Tension Persists in Fergana

LD2806084789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0800 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Kokand (Fergana Oblast), 28 Jun (TASS)—The overwhelming majority of Fergana Oblast enterprises have returned to their normal work rhythm, which was disrupted by the dramatic events of the first half of the month. Today, the lag in the schedule for the output of goods has been eliminated by the collective of one of the town's major enterprises, the spinning and waving mill.

For all that, however, signs of tension persist. The curfew is still being imposed; motor vehicles coming from other rayons in the oblast are undergoing thorough inspection. Just as before, contradictory rumors are being spread by someone. The residents of the town have been informed of the telephone numbers of the headquarters for dealing with unrest. Here, people can be given exhaustive information on all questions at any time of day.

More Reports on Novyy Uzen Disturbances, Unrest

PRAVDA Reports on 23 Jun Situation

PM2706155589 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 24 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Own correspondent D. Gutenev report under the rubric "We Report Details": "Dialogue Needed"]

[Text] Novyy Uzen City, 23 June—Just a couple of days ago Novyy Uzen Airport was crammed with Caucasian immigrant families. Yesterday everything was back to normal—uninterrupted flights between Novyy Uzen and Makhachkala had been organized.

The work of the informal "Solidarity" Committee which unites Caucasians living in Novyy Uzen helped to a considerable extent to eliminate the congestion and reduce the feeling of panic. At the most critical moment, 18 June, it was at the initiative of the recently formed committee that Caucasian immigrants were persuaded to board buses to be evacuated to safety under the guard of soldiers from the internal forces and militiamen. As a result bloodshed was averted. They were returned to the quieter city at 0400. After this the committee members, bearing people's feelings in mind, engaged in mass political work among Lezgins, Chechens, Ingush, and representatives of other ethnic groups.

At the airport I spoke with many people who were rushing for a flight. S. Eferova, unskilled laborer at the "Uzenenergoneft" Administration and the mother of three children, said:

"Had if not been for the threats, I wouldn't be leaving. I was born and bred here. Things have quieted down since the curfew was brought in, but it's still terrifying."

There were 14 shuttle flights yesterday. By daybreak more than 2,000 people had left Novyy Uzen. In all, according to the committee's list of names, around 6,000 people have private plans to leave permanently or temporarily.

"We clearly realize that the slightest spark," committee chairman N. Beybutov, instructor at the Novyy Uzen City party committee, said, "could set off infighting that we would find hard to control. We are monitoring people's feelings for the time being. We would clearly be helped in this by a similar committee of representatives of Kazakh nationality in order to regulate our relations through dialogue. But no such committee currently exists."

The night passed calmly in Novyy Uzen. Some 60 people were taken to a registration center for breaking the curfew. However, at midnight a crowd of approximately 300 people surrounded and threw rocks at the rayon Internal Affairs Department building in Yeraliyevo Settlement. The hooligans then started breaking the windows of administrative buildings.

There were also disturbances at Mangyshlak Station. Militia detachments put a stop to the hooligans' intentions.

Kazakh Prosecutor Cited

PM2806093589 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 25 Jun 89 First Edition p 4

[Interview with Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic Prosecutor G.B. Yelemisov by Lieutenant Colonel A. Ladin: "Tackling Urgent Issues"; date and place of interview not stated]

[Text] Our correspondent met with Kazakh Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Prosecutor Galim Bazhimovich Yelemisov, just back from Novyy Uzen.

"Among the crowds of people holding rallies in the streets and squares of Novyy Uzen," he said, "one still hears slogans demanding the city's deliverance from the 'domination' of people of mainly Lezghian nationality. They are attempting to make the conflict burn brighter on the fuel of ethnic enmity. What brought about such a sharp deterioration in interethnic relations in the Caspian region?

"I definitely do not think it is due to the fact that some people have a better lifestyle than others, as some people in Novyy Uzen would have it. Look, they say, the incomers from the Caucasus have the state stores under their control and food products are seeping out of them into the cooperatives, which, they say, are also under the control of individuals who are not local, Novyy Uzen citizens. I would say that all this is a superficial, not entirely valid, aspect of the conflict that has flared up. A large number of Lezghians and also Chechens are indeed living in Novyy Uzen. Some of them are working in the trade sphere. But we saw Kazakhs and people of other nationalities working alongside them. It is clear that the root of the accumulated problems lies in the fact that many social questions have remained unsolved for a long time. The city party committee and the city soviet executive committee knew about them, but no progress was made.

"The local organs of soviet power still have to beg from union ministries and departments. Temporary staff are an advantage for union ministries. But a social base has to be developed for local workers who have lived in the Caspian region all their lives. So they are a disadvantage to those who are only interested in plan fulfillment percentages and tonnes of oil. If the local soviets had real power they would not allow these and other similar distortions and they would defend the interests of the inhabitants of their city and rayon. But at the moment they have no real power to influence union ministries. So for years there has been talk about oilfields and closely associated enterprises employing indigenous workers. There have been proposals on setting up vocational and technical schools, training combines, and specialist training facilities. But the words were not followed by

action. There is a lot of unemployment at the moment among young people in Novyy Uzen and throughout Yeraliyevskiy Rayon, Mangyshlak Oblast.

"But this is not the only problem. In my view, local party committees and soviets must be headed by principled and responsible people who are keenly aware of the people's worries and concerns, what they are going through. In Novyy Uzen we encountered other leaders who had gotten totally out of touch with the problems and difficulties that were preventing working people from living and working normally. To be frank, they had lost their authority through indifference and inaction.

"We have just received a report from the Guryev Oblast Military Commissariat. Political department chief Lieutenant Colonel Nikolay Pavlovich Ivanov said that the situation in Novyy Uzen had ceased to be as acute as before, although about 24 percent of the workforce failed to turn up for work on 22-23 June. Drivers had to be brought in from other cities to supply the oilmen with necessities. What is particularly worrying is the fact that hooligans are still trying to inflict violence on people of Kazakh nationality. In the environs of the city of Shevchenko a group of drunken youths went by night to a workers' camp intending to set fire to it.

"Militia organs and internal forces have done a great deal of work to prevent unrest. The fact is that their efforts have saved many lives. They are guarding very important facilities which extremists might decide to attack. A great deal of explanatory work is being done. I can definitely say that no offense, let alone crime, goes unpunished. An investigation group, headed by republican deputy prosecutor Arkadiy Dmnitriyevich Myznikov, is operating in Novyy Uzen at the moment.

"At the same time, I want to stress that the republican leadership's efforts are also geared to taking the speediest possible steps to improve food supplies for people living in Novyy Uzen and nearby villages and to improve medical services and to tackle employment and youth training problems. The special government commission headed by O.I. Zheltikov, deputy chairman of the Kazakh SSR Council of Ministers, is continuing its work.

Novyy Uzen Situation 'Normalizing'

PM2706151389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[PRAVDA correspondent D. Gutenev report: "Situation Normalizing"]

[Text] Novyy Uzen, Guryev Oblast—An atmosphere of calm has held out in the city over the last 24 hours. No socially dangerous violations of the curfew have been recorded. Owing to the efforts of party and soviet employees, and law-enforcement organs, the work of enterprises is returning to normal. The activity of nine cooperatives engaged in buying and reselling consumer goods has been suspended. It was relatively calm in other population centers in the south of Guryev Oblast.

The informal "Solidarity"—elected by immigrants from the Caucasus—and "Yedinstvo" committees—the latter representing the Kazakh section of the population—have entered into dialogue. Representatives of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Council of Ministers and the authorities of Dagestan and Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republics have come here to organize contacts and elaborate mutually acceptable decisions to find a way out of the crisis that has taken shape; they are raising the question of compensation for damages to those who left the area for these autonomous republics in connection with the events in Novyy Uzen, Zhetibay, and Yeraliyev. Some 3,500 Caucasian immigrants left Novyy Uzen during these events. The flood of people wanting to leave has decreased.

Calm 'For Past 24 Hours' Noted

LD2706144789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1307 GMT 27 Jun

[Text] Alma-Ata 27 Jun (TASS)—Correspondents Kairbek Yermukhanov and Igor Tobolnov report:

In the Kazakhstan town of Novyy Uzen, where there have been mass disorders for a number of days, the situation has been calm for the past 24 hours. If, in the first days after the introduction of a curfew, the number of those infringing the regime numbered dozens, then at present their numbers have fallen sharply.

Transportation, industrial enterprises, and public catering and other facilities necessary for the normal functioning of the town are operating. However, certain difficulties have arisen in connection with the departure of some individuals of the Kazakh nationality engaged in overhauling wells of the 'Uzenneft' oil and gas extraction association, the most important one in western Kazakhstan.

Urgent measures by party and soviet bodies have made it possible to reduce the acuteness of many problems. Information sheets on the existence of jobs at enterprises and organizations in the town have been distributed. There were about 500 vacancies. With time, new plants will be opened in Novyy Uzen and its environs, but even now, drivers, drilling workers, seamstresses, cooks, and economists are wanted in the town job-placement department.

Production 'Difficulties' Felt

LD2806053889 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2300 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] A report from a TASS correspondent from Guryev Oblast, Kazakhstan:

It is calm today in Novyy Uzen and neighboring population centers. Information coming in to the press center of the republic's Interior Ministry operating here inspires optimism. If in the first days after the imposition of the curfew the number of violators numbered in the tens, then the numbers have fallen sharply now.

Transport, industrial and public catering enterprises, and other facilities important for the normal functioning of the town are operating. However, certain difficulties in production are being felt in connection with the departure of some ethnic Caucasians working at Uzenneft, the largest oil and gas extraction directorate in the Caspian region of Kazakhstan. The management of the Mangyshlakneft association is taking measures to stabilize the situation.

The acuteness of a number of problems is gradually being removed. For instance, on 26 June information sheets on available jobs at enterprises and organizations in the town were distributed—there were about 500 vacancies. With time, new plants will be opened in Novyy Uzen and its suburbs; but even now, drivers, drilling workers, seamstresses, bookkeepers, cooks, economists, and janitors are wanted in the town job placement department. This is a good sign of the normalization of the situation.

A joint session of the Solidarity and Birlik—Unity—committees has taken place. Representatives of the native population and the peoples of the Caucasus elaborated principles for joint work among the masses aimed at achieving mutual understanding and eliminating centers of tension. Members of the government commission are also working actively. They are dealing with issues of the region's social and economic development, with providing housing and improving the urban infrastructure.

Interior Ministry Spokesman on Militia Restructuring

LD2706183489 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1320 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 27 Jun (TASS) - TASS correspondent Nikita Demidov writes:

About 15 percent of subunits with administrative functions have been cut in the course of restructuring being implemented in the system of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD], Yuriy Zhurkin, USSR deputy minister of internal affairs, reported at a news conference here today. According to him in 1987-1988 45,000 employees of internal affairs bodies were deemed to be unsuitable for the posts they occupied according to the results of certification, and of them 25,000 have been dismissed from the militia.

The task of building a law-based state in the USSR, he continued, makes special demands on the internal affairs bodies. "Many MVD subunits," the deputy minister noted, "are still not capable of operating effectively under new conditions, where we have on the agenda issues of combatting organized crime, corruption and where the militia has to act in quite new situations—in disturbances involving nationalities." The work of the militia is impeded by bureaucracy and over-management, which have been cultivated in the bodies over years, Zhurkin said, when report-making—and not specific, real results—was the main thing. He stressed the need to enhance the professional standards of militia staff.

In connection with this, the deputy minister reported in particular that this year a new training curriculum is being introduced for rank-and-file militiamen: The training period will be 10 months instead of the present 4. Special programs for actions where conflicts between the nationalities arise are being studied at the faculty for improving the skills of the MVD Academy and at all educational establishments of the USSR Ministry. Groups have been set up at the republican MVD's and the directorates at which militia staff who do not know the language of the republic study it.

Yuriy Zhurkin drew attention to the reduction in the number of offences and crimes being committed by militia staff. However, he admitted that the situation that has come about cannot but be disturbing nevertheless: Last year 8,468 members of staff were brought to book for malfeasance in office and 1,457 for crimes.

Economic

More Economic Independence, Change Urged

18200390 Moscow SOTSIALISTICHESKAYA INDUSTRIYA in Russian 15 Jun 89 p 1

[Article by Igor Lavrovskiy: "What After the Congress?"]

[Text] What is in store for us after the congress? By all signs, there are not going to be abrupt changes in the state economic policy. However, even in the absence of radical policy changes, a revolutionary situation may arise in the economy.

The traditional European directions of politics in our country have changed places. On the right, we have the proponents of economic dictate by the state; that is, the European left. In turn the supporters of the market model of management are considered to be the left. In England they would rather lean toward the conservatives. This paradox is easy to explain. The past of the West consists of market anarchy, whereas in our past we have war communism, something that is the exact opposite but equally inefficient. We proceed from two different directions, and this is why our political picture is the mirror image of the West.

I, for one, am not bothered by the fact that the proponents of the conservative line have turned out to be in a majority. This is normal. Big leaps usually bring about

big confusion. Besides, the difference in positions reflects differences in the economic status of the regions which the deputies represent.

Existence determines consciousness to a great degree. It is obvious to all that the Baltic area, Moscow, and major cities enjoy a much higher average standard of living than, say, Central Asia or the Non-Chernozem Zone.

The gap in the levels of economic development is quite high. For example, the social productivity of labor in Estonia exceeds that in Uzbekistan by a factor of almost 2.5. If the influence of the price factor is eliminated, even with that taken into account, the ratio of these two republics on this indicator will be similar to that of Belgium and Greece. Hence, the differences in the quality of life. In the rate of passenger car ownership, Estonia approximates Yugoslavia, whereas Azerbaijan, where this statistic is 3 times lower, approximates Turkey. Infant mortality in Lithuania is a little higher than in the United States, whereas that in Central Asia is at the level of poorly developed countries.

At present, those whose economies are the strongest come out in favor of freedom. Those whose economies are the weakest are in favor of control. However, there is a flip side to control. The more developed regions contribute much more to the all-union budget from every ruble than those trailing. Their desire to distribute this heavy burden more evenly is quite understandable. After all, the centralized economy has not been able to prove by deeds its ability to solve the problem of uneven development. Despite multibillion infusions, agriculture continues to remain "the sick man" of our economy. Centralized capital investment literally goes down the drain very quickly, as was the case with the Central Asian irrigation system. These means do not stay in the regions for a longer time. They are skillfully appropriated by mighty Soviet corporations—the Minvodkhoz [Ministry of Land Reclamation and Water Resources], the Minenergo [Ministry of Power and Electrification], and other dashing industrial giants. Their "American aid" leaves combine harvester cemeteries in villages, dry canals in saline ground in the desert, and pipes buried in the ground in the tundra.

This is why the sovereign rights in the economic sphere which the Baltic republics are advocating are also needed by other republics and regions as much if not more. Could a price for cotton this low exist if the republic were entitled to set it independently in agreement with consumers? Could the oilmen and coal industry personnel stoop to state subsidies if Tyumen and the Kuznetsk Basin received legal economic rights? Indeed, regional economic accountability is advantageous for the "rich," but it is still more advantageous for the "poor" because it opens the way to real rather then declared equality. Does the example of Japan, Brazil, and South Korea, which have boldly challenged the strongest ones, not inspire our periphery? Do they have nothing else to pin their hopes on except the benevolence of the center?

Thus far, the unity of the national economic complex has been ensured by the unity of the administrative-command system. The monopoly of ministries has a flip side—the single-crop economy of regions. It does not make any difference for the paper-pushing management of the center how the overall volume of production is distributed among individual enterprises and regions as long as the ends meet in the balance sheets. Understandably it is easier to deal with large-size enterprises and single-crop regions. Hence the industrial megalomania, devastation of nature, and social conflicts.

Genuine integration in the economy of our country is only possible on the basis of a unified, developed national market. No amount of transfusions through the state budget and the Gosplan [State Planning Committee] will replace a far-flung system of direct links among regions which brings about mutual dependence. Making regional economic accountability the foremost among the priorities of economic reform, suggested by the report of N. Ryzhkov, gives us hope for changes.

It should be profitable for the industrially developed regions to invest funds in the development of those trailing. To this end, we should do away with the practice of monopolistic low prices for raw materials in the environment of growing prices for everything except raw materials and agricultural products.

Regional economic accountability and the autonomy of enterprises are two sides of the same coin. The added product generated as a result of the transfer of processing to a raw material region should be distributed on a fixed basis among the enterprise, the region, and the state rather than being appropriated by the center.

The prosperity of industrial regions is advantageous for the raw material regions, as this expands the market for the sale of their products. Is commercial cotton more attractive for the population of industrial regions of the USSR than fruits and melon crops grown in the southern sun without nitrates, in the consumption of which we hold stable last places? "Live" cash of the consumers, if it is given freedom, will not flow into the expense books of superministries, but into melons, grapes, fabrics, microelectronics, and other labor-intensive kinds of products which can be manufactured on the basis of interregional integration.

Mutual linkage—this is the key word of regional economic accountability. The economically developed minority should understand that the scales will begin to tip in its favor when all others perceive a benefit for themselves in it. Releasing the initiative and economic freedom of the advanced regions is the only hope for the economic renaissance of the less successful regions. We are on the same team and we can get moving only by making a joint effort.

The report of Chairman of the Council of Ministers N.I. Ryzhkov on the composition of the USSR Government was brief. However, it almost said more about our economic prospects than had been said in all preceding days combined. A radical reform is already here rather than around the corner. A reduction in the number of branch ministries by 40 percent with a simultaneous reduction of their staffs is creating a revolutionary situation in the economy. The ministerial "upper echelons" with their new make-up will not be able to manage in the old manner, try as they might. They will not have the physical power.

The old system of economic links must collapse to a significant degree once the ministries are liquidated. The role of the "middle echelon"—major associations, former main directorates (if they manage to survive in one form or another), a few concerns, and the MNTK [Interbranch Scientific and Technological Combine]—will increase abruptly. Whether they want it or not, they will have to assume responsibility for developing a new system of social division of labor together with the banks. Economists will have to prove the advantages of the market in "an open field" rather than in an auditorium.

In my previous articles before the congress, I proposed to give economic autonomy to existing branch ministries without destroying their structure, make them large state corporations, and put them in a situation where it would be advantageous for them to split into smaller parts on their own. In the process the number of ministries involved in regulating the economy could be reduced to about three to five. However, by now the well-known "Hungarian variant" has been opted for—a gradual reduction in the number of ministries and reliance on the autonomy of smaller economic organizations. The Hungarian experience shows that in this case we should swiftly introduce antimonopoly legislation and make the finance and credit policy more rigorous. Otherwise, industry will again try to form its "quasiministries" aiming at preserving the advantages of a monopoly. A lot will also depend on how successful the enterprises and associations are going to be in switching from the strategy of obedience to that of reasonable initiative. This will not be accomplished without a swift and adequate solution to the problem of property. Science knows of no cases when serfs, even those allowed to practice quitrent, developed "the demeanor of a master."

The creation of Gosagroprom [State Agroindustrial Committee] in its time showed that the merging of ministries not only fails to solve any problems, but creates them. This is why it is worthwhile to consider creating a centralized economic "rescue service" with funds, resources, and economic expertise. After all, economic dislocations may bring no less trouble than natural calamities.

The congress euphoria is abating. Indeed, many people expected more radical shifts. However, life goes on—the congress has shown that the country is ripe for change. If this is so, the changes will come about.

Agricultural

Ligachev, Baklanov Visit 'Gorizont' Plant

PM2706152389 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Defense Sectors' Designs for Agro-Industrial Complex"]

[Text] Ye.K. Ligachev, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, visited Moscow's "Gorizont" Plant on 26 June.

The experimental units which the plant's designers have enterprisingly developed to process milk and fruit and vegetables aroused great interest. These units are notable for their new and nontraditional design. Defense industry materials and technologies have been used here.

It is envisaged that extensive use will be made of superhigh-frequency oscillators in the food industry. The new equipment for processing milk and preserving fruit is 2-3 times less energy- and materials-intensive in comparison with series-produced equipment with equal productivity. Its important advantage is its mobility, which is particularly necessary at collective farms and state farms.

Having expressed a high opinion of the collective's resourcefulness and of the first prototypes of the equipment, Ye.K. Ligachev tasked the plant's workers and engineers with drastically speeding up work to finish the new units, subject them to comprehensive tests, and start up series production. The main thing is to reconstruct the food industry at rapid rates and manufacture equipment of a world technical standard.

The attention of the ministry and department leaders participating in the visit was drawn to the need to offer the plant organizational and material-technical aid to speed up the manufacture of food equipment.

At a meeting with the plant's collective Ye.K. Ligachev spoke about the basic guidelines for contemporary agrarian policy elaborated at the CPSU Central Committee March Plenum and about the work of the Congress of USSR People's Deputies, and he answered numerous questions.

Ye.K. Ligachev and O.D. Baklanov were accompanied by I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, A.S. Systsov, USSR minister of the aviation industry, and V.I. Kuznetsov and B.I. Balashov, secretaries of Moscow City party committee and Moscow Oblast party committee.

Nikonov Addresses Kiev Soil Conference

18240187 SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 17 Jun 89 p 2

[TASS Report: "The Land Is Responsive to Concern: A Seminar in Kiev Oblast"]

[Text] Since olden days the villager has measured the fruits of his labor by the basic peasant law which is as topical now as it ever was: Give back to the earth more than you take from it. Even today, without solving this agricultural problem, there will not be a single step forward in crop-growing. More fertilizers, herbicides, and pesticides are being used every year, but productivity is not growing. On the contrary, a process of land depletion is underway, and in a number of places, complete degradation.

An all-union seminar-meeting took place on 14-15 June in Kiev Oblast dedicated to issues of intensification of agriculture, increased soil fertility, and ecological balance.

V.P. Nikonov, Politburo member and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, participated in its work.

Taking part in the seminar were academicians; corresponding members of the V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences; leaders of centers for scientific support of the branches of the agro-industrial complex of a number of union republics and oblasts, branch scientific complexes, all-union, republican, and zonal institutes, and scientific-production and production systems; directors of state land-planning institutes; obkom [oblast committee] and kraykom [kray committee] secretaries; workers of agrarian departments of republican and oblast party committees; and representatives of union ministries and departments.

Kiev Oblast was not a random choice for familiarization with the application of resource-preserving and soil-conserving methods of crop production. Here, with the assistance of scientists, was developed and assimilated an effective soil and water (regional) conservation system with a reclamation-centered survey organization of the territory. In association with other measures, it will allow the loss of soil due to water and wind erosion to be halted and an increased yield of agricultural lands to be achieved with minimum expense. The seminar participants were convinced of this having visited farms and scientific institutions. Their attention was called to the experience of the "Khotovskiy" Sovkhoz [state farm] of Kievo-Svyatoshinskiy, and the Zapovit Ilicha Kolkhoz [collective farm] of Obukhovskiy Rayon, where new systems are already yielding real results.

At the plenary session held afterwards, which was opened by V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences President A.A. Nikonov, V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences Vice President A.N. Kashtanov read a report on scientific provision for farming, increasing soil fertility, and protecting soil from erosion. Having underscored that the main resource of production in agriculture was, is, and always will be the land, he spoke with alarm of the growing negative processes leading to depletion of plowed land and loss of its productivity. The task of achieving outstanding growth in soil fertility was advanced as an alternative.

Reports on the issues under discussion were heard from A.N. Tkachenko, first deputy chairman of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Gosagroprom [State Agro-industrial Committee]; A.A. Sozinov, chairman of the Southern Division of V.I. Lenin All-Union Academy of Agricultural Sciences; V.F. Sayko, director of the Ukrainian NII [Scientific Research Institute] for Farming, and others.

V.P. Nikonov spoke before the seminar participants.

In characterizing the general political situation in the country, he particularly noted that the work completed by the Congress of USSR People's Deputies has become its own form of political school where, on the basis of broad pluralism of opinions on the course of restructuring, the development of democratization, and glasnost, the deputies frequently gave harsh assessments of genuine reality and the slow resolution of many of the most acute social problems. With all its diversity of opinions, the discussion at the congress was in harmony with the fundamental ideas proposed after April 1985, especially at the 19th Party Conference and in the party's pre-electoral program.

Restructuring of the political system is underway on a wide front. Radical economic reform is being implemented simultaneously. One of the central tasks is the transfer of the economy to the rails of scientific and technological progress. In this program, the CPSU Central Committee secretary described in detail the measures and efforts being undertaken by the party for decisive improvement of the country's provision of foodstuffs.

The fate of the foodstuffs program troubles everyone. In it lies a key link of restructuring. It is, therefore, fitting that such a picturesque leitmotiv as "if we don't feed the people enough, there won't be any restructuring" resounded in many people's deputies' speeches at the congress.

The main thing now holding back resolution of the foodstuffs problem is first of all the lagging of production-economic measures in the village, and secondly the serious neglect in many farming regions. Unsatisfactory utilization of land as the fundamental means of agricultural production reflects most negatively on the situation of all branches of the agro-industrial complex and the country's economy on the whole.

Among the reasons for this, the speaker named poor management attitudes toward preservation of agricultural lands and increasing their fertility. In view of the

demands of the March (1989) CPSU Central Committee Plenum, the task has been set for carefully investigating and strictly accounting for all agricultural lands, determining measures for their most rational utilization, and including allocation under long-term leasing.

Attention was paid to serious derelictions in the assimilation of effecting farming systems. Many scientific institutions and newly created scientific support centers of the agro-industrial complex were limited to the development of only zonal systems without a concrete link to one farm or another or to an actual field or plot. A significant portion of the developments grew obsolete, requiring refinement with consideration to granting farms independence in their choice of plantings and producing products.

Concrete examples show what comes of a lack of persistence in the assimilation and practical application of soil-protecting technologies of soil treatment and other effective measures for increasing its fertility. Crop cultivation production losses from soil erosion are high in the Ukraine. The scale of soil-conservation methods in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and the Moldavian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] is being reduced. They are poorly utilized in the Transcaucasian republics where erosion processes are more intense. In the entire country, for example, antierosion treatment is applied to 59 million hectares, which is only 64 percent of the area subject to erosion processes.

It was noted that the course taken several years ago toward the assimilation of intensive technologies of agricultural crop cultivation is now the main line for increased output of agricultural production. However, the production of results in various crops and on various farms is not yet sufficient. The speaker called attention to concrete derelictions in this matter. It was emphasized that the future lies beyond these intensive technologies. By 1995 they must be assimilated on 60 million hectares, and by 2000, on 80 million hectares, and from these fields no less than 180-200 million metric tons of grain must be obtained.

Many of our misfortunes in farming are connected with the fact that managers and specialists of farms, agroindustrial organs, and scientific institutions have not always manifested a persistent aspiration to master the achievements of scientific and technological progress and advanced experience. This thought is illustrated by examples of a different relation to one of the focal problems examined at the seminar, that of the principally new soil-conserving system of farming developed in Kiev, with a reclamation-centered survey organization of the territory.

The speaker noted that it is necessary to raise the scientific-economic soundness of soil-conservation measures, to develop a system of economic sanctions on the land-users, and to strengthen the execution of planned, concrete organizational-economic measures.

A significant place in the speech was given to the problem of the scientific support base of the country's agroindustrial complex in its entirety. Almost 2 years have passed since the adoption of the resolution on the restructuring of agricultural science. The course of its execution has already been discussed twice, in Moscow and Krasnodar. No small amount has been done in this direction. However, sluggishness and serious deficiencies are allowed into the resolution of a number of issues regarding scientific support for the agro-industrial complex.

In many republics, krays, and oblasts, the created scientific support centers have not yet formed comprehensive scientific-technological programs of branch development, and have not conducted the necessary work in organizing the scientific-production and production systems. Lagging in the development of fundamental research continues, especially in selection and biotechnology, in electronics applications, in scientific developments in the area of the economy, and the restructuring of production relations in the village.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary analyzed in detail how one of the basic problems of the scientific support centers of the agro-industrail complex is being solved—the determination of the circulation of the most advanced technologies, and the assimilation of the achievements of scientific and technological progress in production. The best results in the integration of science and production are achieved in scientific-production associations and scientific-production systems. Over 670 of them have been created for crop-growing; of these 440 are scientific production centers. Work is being actively conducted to create such formations in the RSFSR, the Ukrainian SSR and the Kazakh SSR.

The experience of the work of the Lipetsk scientific production system "Rape," the Kurgan system "Corn," the Ternopol production system "Buckwheat," and others convincingly testifies to the correctness of the chosen form of unification of science and production. Many systems have a great number of farms under their influence and they assist growth in production output not only on the territory of their oblasts, krays, or autonomous republics, but beyond their boundaries as well. In light of this, attention was paid to the fact that each system is obligated to introduce what is new, the latest advances, and take a truly major step toward the resolution of this or that problem.

The CPSU Central Committee secretary spoke exigently of the serious need to improve research work at the All-Union Selection-Genetics Institute (in Odessa) and a number of other scientific institutions. Serious comments were addressed to the machine builders of the Ministry of Automotive and Agricultural Machine Building system, and other union and republic departments which are called upon to provide the economy

with high-output equipment for application in a soil conservation system of farming on hillside land and in the struggle against pests and diseases of agricultural crops.

V.P. Nikonov emphasized that the scientific support of the agro-industrial complex must indeed be raised to a new level; it must allow every scientist and specialist to take a worthy position in the resolution of the foodstuffs problem, which is a most important political task.

Responsible workers of the CPSU Central Committee and the USSR Council of Ministers participated in the seminar.

During his stay in Kiev Oblast, V.P. Nikonov also visited the Ukrainian NII for breeding pedigreed livestock; he familiarized himself with scientists' new developments in the area of biotechnology and selection, and viewed an exhibition of pedigreed stock. The need for more effective realization of the genetic potential of agricultural animals through the use of the latest animal husbandry techniques was discussed.

Issues were raised during visits to labor collectives on the acceleration of the resolution of the foodstuffs problem and social reorientation of the economy.

With V.P. Nikonov were G.I. Revenko, first secretary of the Kiev party obkom, and I.S. Plyushch, chairman of the oblispolkom [oblast executive committee].

Early June Weather, Crop Developments Reported

18240184b Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN in Russian 15 June 89 p 1

[Agrometeorologist T. Ivashneva report: "The Weather and the Crops"]

[Text] Hot weather was observed during the first 10 days over a large part of the European territory of the USSR: Average air temperature was 3 to 8 degrees above the average taken over many years. Significant precipitation (30 to 80 millimeters, and more in some places) fell in the western oblasts of the Ukraine and Belorussia, the Baltic area, Moldavia, and the Northwest region. There was little precipitation in the central and northeast oblasts of the Ukraine, the northwest of the Central Chernozem region and the southwest of the Central Region, the Kalmyk ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic], Astrakhan Oblast, and the Zavolzhye area, and also over a large part of the Urals region.

Because of the hot weather, plant development is proceeding more quickly than the 10-to-20-day average established over many years. Winter grain crops have formed ears and blossomed, and in the southern Ukraine, Moldavia, and the North Caucasus area grain has completed its ripening. In the Ukraine, Rostov Oblast, the south of Nizhniy Povolzhye, the Central Chernozem area, the south of the Central Region, and most of Belorussia early spring grain crops have formed ears, and in the extreme south of the Ukraine, south Rostov Oblast, and the North Caucasus spring barley has reached milky ripeness.

In Belorussia, the Baltic area, and Pskov and Smolensk Oblasts the racemes have appeared early on the flax, while in the Ukraine it has blossomed. In Moldavia, the south of the Ukraine, and the North Caucasus, and also in Saratov Oblast and the south of Orenburg Oblast, early sowings of sunflower have entered the raceme-forming stage. The period of leaf-forming continues on later sowings in the zone where sunflower is cultivated for industrial purposes. In the Ukraine and the south of Belorussia the racemes have formed on the potatoes, and in the southern regions of the Ukraine, Rostov Oblast, and Krasnodar and Stavropol Krays they have flowered. Over the rest of the European territory of the USSR the formation of side shoots is in progress. The condition of the plants is good.

In the Transcaucasian republics the weather has been warm. In Armenia and Azerbaijan winter wheat has reached the stage of waxy ripeness. In Azerbaijan budding has been observed on the cotton plants.

In Siberia it is colder than usual. The average air temperature for the 10-day period has been 2 to 4 degrees below the many-year average. In most oblasts there has been air or ground frost. Distribution of precipitation was uneven: less than 5 millimeters in Tyumen Oblast and 45 to 55 millimeters in Tomsk and Irkutsk Oblasts and Khabarovsk Kray. In the northern half of Kazakhstan the weather was varied: In the western part it was warm, in the eastern part, cool

North of a line Tyumen-Omsk-Novosibirsk stem growth has occurred on winter crops, and south of that line the plants have formed ears. Spring grain crops are in the stage of forming the third leaf, and in east Kazakhstan, the south of Altay Kray, and East Siberia they have become bushy. Potato planting continues.

In the Central Asian republics the average air temperature for the 10-day period was close to the average. During the first half of the 10-day period the air was heated to 33 to 40 degrees. Then the temperature dropped slightly; there was little precipitation. In Kirgizia, Tajikistan, and South Kazakhstan the winter wheat flowered, and in the east of Uzbekistan grain reached milky ripeness, while in southeast Tajikistan and Turkmenia the wheat has ripened and harvesting has begun. Leaf-forming took place on cotton plants, and in southern rayons and places in the Fergana valley buds were setting, while in Mari and Chardzhou Oblasts there was massive bud forming 4 to 9 days later than the average time.

Scientific

'Resurs-F' Satellite Launched 27 Jun

LD2806064789 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0546 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow, 28 June (TASS)—The artificial earth satellite "Resurs-F" was launched by the carrier rocket "Soyuz" in the Soviet Union on Tuesday. It is intended for taking multi-zonal and spectro-zonal photographs of varied scale with the aim of continuing the study of the earth's natural resources in the interests of different branches of the USSR's national economy and of international cooperation. The satellite has been placed in orbit with the following parameters: initial period of revolution, 88.7 minutes; apogee 262 km; perigee, 195 km; orbital inclination, 82.6 degrees. The apparatus aboard the satellite is working normally.

Space Official on 'Astron' Satellite Program

LD2706195789 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0800 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] The Soviet satellite Astron has completed its research program. It was placed in orbit in 1983 and researched distant worlds. Our correspondent has interviewed Academician Aleksandr Alekseyevich Boyarchuk, head of the scientific part of the project.

[Begin recording] [Reporter] Aleksandr Alekseyevich, Astron worked in orbit for 6 years. What new things has mankind found out about our universe as a result?

[Boyarchuk] In this age it is very difficult to discover something absolutely new. Individual phenomena which shake the world happen very rarely—superconductivity, for example. But as far as more specific, purely scientific work is concerned, we have obviously obtained a great deal of material. When we started this work in 1975, we did not expect such great success. We have a lot of data about unstable stars, we have much data about an erupting supernova in the Magellanic Cloud. In particular, we have interesting data about the chemical composition, about the dynamics of the envelope.

There were also interesting observations of Halley's Comet. We monitored its approach, in effect, for almost a whole year at various comet-Earth and comet-Sun distances. Molecules left its surface in a variety of ways and disintegrated under hard radiation from the Sun. The investigation of clear spectra, without atmospheric interference, allowed us to estimate the loss of mass resulting from the evaporation from the nucleus of the comet that was recorded by the Vega and Giotto probes. And on the whole, having monitored a fairly large part of the trajectory, we were able to establish the loss of mass during one revolution. And thereby we were able to estimate how many such revolutions around the sun it will take—how much longer the comet will survive. And according to our estimates, in approximately 30 revolutions there will be no more Halley's Comet. Thirty revolutions is about 2,000 years. Of course there will be the nucleus which will continue to go around but there will be no tail. It's all going to evaporate in the course of its earlier travels. This is of cosmological significance. It follows that the comet was captured comparatively recently, perhaps 30,000 years ago. But in astronomical age 30,000 years is next to nothing.

[Reporter] When the station was launched you were counting on it working for a year. Anyway, that was the guaranteed time. But the station worked for 6 years.

[Boyarchuk] Well, first of all, why a year? The year applied to the component base. It would not let it move any longer. As far as scientific programs were concerned, we set up a reserve scientific program and the durability of the probe allowed us to react well and quickly to all the new astronomical phenomena that arose suddenly.

[Reporter] The conclusion of the commission says that the station carried out a volume of research which is normally planned for two or three probes. Do you agree with that?

[Boyarchuk] Yes, I agree with that, because it was planned that we would have some 200 communications sessions during 1 year, while altogether we had 600 sessions.

[Reporter] This was the first observatory. Do you think that this work should be continued?

[Boyarchuk] We are proceeding along the right road. That such work should be continued is also shown by the fact that the Americans, for example, have built their space telescope—an extremely expensive telescope—some $600 million. But they went ahead and spent it.

Military

Further Reportage on Nuclear Submarine Accident

Sub Arrives in Severomorsk

LD2806082489 Moscow TASS in English 0742 GMT 28 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 28 TASS—The nuclear-powered submarine which broke down in the Norwegian Sea on Monday, arrived in the Severomorsk base of the Northern Fleet this morning, Admiral Konstantin Makarov, chief of staff of the Soviet Navy, told TASS.

A technical commission led by Vice Admiral Vitaliy Zaytsev, deputy commander-in-chief of the Soviet Navy for maintenance and repairs, began studying the vessel to determine the reasons for the breakdown.

Admiral Makarov cited some data supplied by specialists: The radiation situation on the submarine is normal, the cooling of the main power plant goes smoothly—the reactor's temperature has dropped from Tuesday's 108

degrees Centigrade to 73 degrees. "Water used for cooling the engine installation is not dumped overboard. It is collected in a special bunker," the admiral noted.

Military Paper Reports Incident

Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 27 Jun 89 First Edition p 1

[Article by Capt 3rd Rank P. Ishchenko: "The First Details"]

[Text] The radiation situation on board the submarine is normal. There has been no radioactive contamination of the surrounding environment. The ship is sailing using engines which are working off of the ship's own sources of power.

As was announced in the Staff of the Northern Fleet, at 1300 the Soviet motorship "Konstantin Yuon" arrived in the area of the submarine and replenished its supplies of fresh water. Today the Northern Fleet's rescue ship "Karabakh" should reach the submarine, and depending on the circumstances, take the ship under tow or accompany it travelling under its own power back to base. There are no threats to the health of the crew.

The submarine, commanded by Captain 1st Rank Yu. Kasatkin, was returning from a lengthy voyage of many weeks. The submarine was constructed 25 years ago. Before embarking on the lengthy voyage it underwent yard repair. The reasons for the breakdown in the hermetic seal of the primary circuit will be established after the ship returns to base.

Makarov Cited on Safety Precautions

LD2706133289 Moscow TASS in English 1434 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Text] Moscow June 27 TASS—"There are both nuclear and conventional powered weapons on board the nuclear-powered submarine. But they are in a safe condition and are not related to the breakdown," stated Admiral Konstantin Makarov, chief of the main headquarters of the Navy. "The situation as a whole does not present any danger." The submarine is now in tow, heading for its home base.

The admiral pointed out that the submarine crew under the command of Captain First Class Yuriy Kasatkin acted competently and confidently in the situation that had developed.

Makarov gave an interview to TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy in connection with the June 26 breakdown on board the Soviet nuclear-powered submarine.

In view of assertions by the Norwegian side about an ostensible fire on board the submarine the admiral said: "There was no fire on board".

Makarov explained that when the crew had shut down both nuclear reactors the submarine had surfaced. Auxiliary engines—diesel electric plants—had been switched on and produced exhaust emissions. They had billowed two pillars of smoke which were sighted by a plane and were apparently mistaken for the smoke of a fire.

Then the admiral said that some mass media connected the appearance of navymen in life-saving jackets on the upper deck with a supposed evacuation.

"There is a simple explanation to that. Air temperature on board the submarine rose because air conditioners ceased to function, and navymen went out on deck for fresh air. They were allowed to be on deck only in life-saving jackets."

The admiral said this was one of the first Soviet nuclear-powered submarines with quite a long length of service. But this, according to the admiral, should be in no way connected with the breakdown.

A commission has been set up with Vice-Admiral Vitaliy Zaytsev, deputy Navy commander-in-chief for maintenance and repairs at the head to find out the causes of what happened.

In order to reach its home base as soon as possible the submarine has been taken in tow by the rescue vessel Karabakh. They move at a speed of eight knots. The submarine is to reach the base at Severomorsk at midday tomorrow, June 28, twenty-four hours earlier than previously expected, the admiral said.

The onboard reactor is being steadily cooled down, Makarov said. The personnel are safe and sound and no one was exposed to radiation.

Measurements made inside the submarine to specify the radiological situation as well as the measurements of the water trail left by the submarine indicate that the radiation level is within the background limits.

The chief of the main headquarters of the Navy is an experienced career submariner. He served with both conventional and nuclear-powered submarines.

Yazov Describes Towing Operation

PM2706164589 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 28 Jun 89 Morning Edition p 3

[R. Ignatyev: "Details for IZVESTIYA": "Nuclear Submarine: Reactor Temperature Falling"]

[Text] As IZVESTIYA reported yesterday, at 0417 on 26 June 1989 there was an accident on a Soviet nuclear submarine in the Norwegian Sea. It is on the surface headed for the base in Severomorsk. Here is what USSR Defense Minister D. Yazov told our correspondent on the morning of 27 June:

"Specialists reached the submarine on 27 June. They were set down on the submarine, inspected all the compartments, and took water and air samples. They found that the radiation situation on the ship was normal, there was no evidence of environmental pollution, the personnel were unaffected, and there was no threat to the men's health. Radiation contamination is ruled out. The main power plant, as we reported earlier, has been shut down and is cooling according to plan.

"The motor ship 'Konstantin Yuon' brought the submarine the fresh water required to cool down the reactor. Its temperature is gradually falling. Whereas on the morning of 26 June it was 150 degrees [scale not specified], by the evening it had dropped to 120. By the morning of 27 June the temperature had fallen to 108 degrees.

"The water used to cool the reactor is not being jettisoned overboard but is being collected in a special tank. The rescue ship 'Karabakh' now has the submarine in tow. The speed has now risen to seven knots. At the first stage the submarine was accompanied by the large antisubmarine warfare ship 'Simferopol' and the refrigerator transport 'V. Lyagin.' They escorted the boat and provided it with essential supplies. Then the tanker 'Dnestr' arrived to take over and replenish the stocks of fresh water.

"Everything is calm on the submarine. Since it is hot—25-30 degrees—in all the compartments the personnel are regularly going up onto the weather deck. All the seamen are wearing lifejackets, as required by the regulations. A Norwegian aircraft and a Norwegian helicopter have flown over the ship on several occasions. Naturally, from the air they could see our ships congregating around the submarine. They will have seen members of the crew on the weather deck. Apparently, Norwegian experts have also taken air and water samples in the accident area and carried out their own investigations.

"No outside help is required. We expect the submarine to reach Severomorsk on 28 or 29 June. It is too early to talk about the causes of the incident. A technical commission has been set up to carry out a careful investigation of all the circumstances of the accident and establish the causes.

"The nuclear submarine on which the accident occurred is one of our older submarines. It was built 25 years ago. It is commanded by Captain 1st Class Yu. Kasatkin."

Vice Admiral Interviewed

LD2706180289 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1430 GMT 27 Jun 89

[Interview with Vice Admiral Yuriy Nikolayevich Patrushev, chief of staff of the Northern Fleet, by unidentified television correspondent on 26 June; first paragraph is introduction; from the "Vremya" newscast—recorded]

[Text] As has already been reported, on 26 June the main power plant went out of order onboard a Northern Fleet nuclear submarine in an area south of Medvezhiy Island. The crew was not affected, and the power plant was shut down. At present, the submarine is proceeding to base on the surface. A permanent communication link is being maintained. Yesterday, our correspondent talked to Vice Admiral Yuriy Nikolayevich Patrushev, chief of staff of the Northern Fleet. [video cuts to a shot of Severomorsk harbor, with naval ships at their berths; then shows Patrushev being interviewed in his study by an unidentified correspondent]

[Begin recording] [correspondent] Yuriy Nikolayvich, could you tell us what happened with the nuclear submarine in the Medvezhiy area today?

[Patrushev] Today, 26 June, at 0427, the Fleet Command received a report from the submarine located in an area 325 km south of Medvezhiy Island to the effect that a loss of airtightness of the primary circuit had been observed onboard the submarine. It is a nuclear submarine, with the primary circuit supporting the operation of the steam turbine plant.

[Correspondent] In other words, of the reactor, right?

[Patrushev] Yes, of the reactor. The submarine surfaced. The radioactive conditions onboard the submarine are normal. The crucial factor in situations like this is whether there is enough feed water for cooling the main power plant.

[Correspondent] There are no casualties, right?

[Patrushev] There are none. Neither have any of the crew been overexposed to radiation. We checked the stocks of water on board the submarine, pronouncing them insufficient for the operation, and on establishing cooperation with our shipping lines, with our Murmansk Fishing Fleet, in coordination with the management, we dispatched vessels from the adjoining are. They have already closed in and are now engaged in the transfer of additional water stocks, of water which is necessary for conducting the operation of cooling the main power plant. [video cuts to an operational map with a symbol in red in the center. Logos read: K-192, 0400, Il-58]

[Correspondent] In other words, the submarine is now stationary, it is now located....

[Patrushev interrupts] No, the submarine is on the move, using its diesel engines, propelling itself. The main power plant had been shut down using the entire stock of absorbers. [video shows a close-up of torpedo boat 405 in Severomorsk harbor and a military helicopter flying overhead] When our northern fleet vessels arrive—a large antisubmarine vessel will arrive at about 2200, to be joined a bit later, at about 0200, by the "Karabakh" rescue vessel—final measures will be taken. We will probably tow the submarine in order to speed up its journey and arrival at the base. [video shows a submarine at its berth]

[Correspondent] Is it possible that something will happen on board the submarine before the Northern Fleet vessels arrive?

[Patrushev] The fact is, when a nuclear reactor stops operation, that is, when the steam turbine plant goes out of order, the loads onboard the submarine—those on the electric circuitry, on the electric equipment of the submarine—are, naturally, reduced. That is why the threat of a potential fire breaking out is practically ruled out. In these conditions, considering the range of measures which are taken to normalize the situation, particularly that involving the circuit, the primary circuit, measures are taken which are associated with the washing through the reactor, and everything which is...[pauses] which requires special monitoring is removed into the tanks of the submarine, which are specially designed to collect-...[pauses] the tanks designated expressly for that purpose, specifically designed and designated for that purpose. [video cuts to shot of the map with the logos indicating "Cherepovets 1400", "Ayaks 1027", "V. Lyagin 1220", "Kyuon 1100"]

Apart from that, we are going to investigate the submarine's route with a vessel specifically detached for that purpose, which has both the equipment on board and the special-purpose groups for making measurements. We will then report our observations. We will hide nothing. As there are vessels of other states in the area, particularly Norway, they are probably going to do the same, and the collation of our results will show that...[pause] today, now, we are sure that there should be nothing wrong there, according to our estimates, which might lead to some kind of ecological changes in the area. [end recording] [final shot of two ships in harbor]

Further on Chernavin's Remarks

PM2806125189 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 28 Jun 89 First Edition p 3

[Correspondent Captain 2d Rank S. Turchenko report on interview with Fleet Admiral V. Chernavin, commander in chief of the Navy; date, place not specified: "The Boat Is Returning to Base. Comment by Admiral of the Fleet V. Chernavin, commander of the Navy"]

[Text] It has already been reported that an accident occurred in the main power installation of one of the Northern Fleet's nuclear-powered submarines on 26 June 1989.

Unfortunately, we did not manage to immediately obtain any additional information about the submarine incident. Admiral K. Makarov, chief of the Navy's Main Staff, flatly refused to comment on the announcement "In the USSR Ministry of Defense." Following lengthy attempts to find out something, I had to ask for help from the commander in chief of the Navy.

"The submarine commanded by Captain 1st Rank Yuriy Kasatkin sent a prearranged signal to report the development of abnormality in the functioning of the main power installation associated with the first loop system," Admiral of the Fleet V. Chernavin told me. "The boat has two water-cooled, water-moderated reactors. According to our rules, they must be switched off in such circumstances. The crew followed instructions. Both reactors were shut down. The boat surfaced and its auxiliary engines—diesel-electric installations—were turned on. It is proceeding under its own power back to base from a point some 300 miles away from Severomorsk."

"What measures were adopted in connection with the incident?"

"We immediately dispatched aircraft to the area where the boat was, in case communications were broken off and also in case the crew needed any help (the aircraft are supplied with rescue equipment). Two civilian vessels, a rescue squad from Severomorsk, and a large antisubmarine warfare ship also set course for there at once. The continuous flow of information indicates that there are no crew casualties and that the installation is cooling down according to plan. Radiation conditions in the sixth section where the reactors are situated and in the vessel as a whole are normal. No environmental pollution is anticipated since water from the damaged loop is being collected in a special tank. Local weather conditions are so far good. Therefore, the situation is not fraught with danger either to the crew or the vessel and requires no emergency measures.

"The Western mass media responded keenly to the incident. Suddenly I started getting telephone calls, people asking: Is it true that Norwegian helicopters which arrived at the accident site saw our seamen in the water wearing life jackets? I must say that, according to reports from the boat, no helicopters were sighted in the area. There were aircraft from which seamen in life jackets could have been observed on the top deck. But this type of clothing must always be worn when surfacing. Reports that there were people in the water do not correspond with reality."

"Does the boat have nuclear weapons on board?"

"There are both conventional and nuclear weapons on board. They are in a safe condition, and the incident is in no way associated with them."

"Is it already possible to say anything about the causes of the accident?"

"A nuclear-powered submarine is a very complex feat of engineering and technology. It is hard to make any assumptions in advance. We expect that the boat, under its own power and escorted by surface ships, will have returned to base 29 June. We will then get down to tackling the causes of the accident."

The editorial office will try to keep readers informed.